

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CCXXIII.]

JULY, 1863.

[VOL. XIX.]

BISHOP BLOMFIELD.*

SOME persons who have little love for Bishops may yet regard without dissatisfaction the existence of a class of men who, not infrequently springing from the middle and even lower ranks of English society, win their way to the highest places of honour, and sit side by side with the Howards, Percies, Stanleys and other hereditary legislators, in the upper chamber of the Parliament of England. John Selden, one of the great Erastians of the 17th century, once dropped in his Table Talk this remark: "It will be a great discouragement to scholars that Bishops should be put down; for now the father can say to his son, and the tutor to his pupil, '*Study hard, and you shall have vocem et sedem in parlamento.*'" Sydney Smith thus, with his felicitous vernacular wit, amplified Selden's remark: "The great emoluments of the Church are flung open to the lowest ranks of the community. Butchers, bakers, publicans, schoolmasters, are perpetually seeing their children elevated to the mitre. Let a respectable baker drive through the city from the west-end of the town, and let him cast an eye on the battlements of Northumberland House, has his little muffin-faced son the smallest chance of getting in among the Percies, enjoying a share of their luxury and splendour, and of chasing the deer, with hound and horn, upon the Cheviot Hills? But let him drive his alum-steeped loaves a little farther, till he reaches St. Paul's Churchyard, and all his thoughts are changed when he sees that beautiful fabric; it is not impossible that his little penny roll may be introduced into that splendid oven. Young Crumpet is sent to school—takes to his books—spends the best years of his life, as all eminent Englishmen do, in making Latin verses—knows that the *crum* in crumpet is long and the *pet* short—goes to the university—gets a prize for an essay on the Dispersion of the Jews—takes orders—becomes a Bishop's chaplain—has a young nobleman for his pupil—publishes a useless classic and a serious call to the unconverted—and then goes through the Elysian transitions of Prebendary, Dean, Prelate, and the long train of purple, profit and power." In truth, many of our most famous Churchmen, who have adorned

* A Memoir of Charles James Blomfield, D.D., Bishop of London; with Selections from his Correspondence. Edited by his Son, Alfred Blomfield, M.A., Fellow of All-Souls' College, Oxford, and Incumbent of St. Philip's, Stepney. In Two Volumes. London—John Murray. 1863.

the hierarchy by their learning and virtues or disgraced it by their intolerance and vices, have sprung from a very humble origin. Tonstall, Bonner and Gardiner have the taint (their misfortune, not their crime) of illegitimacy. The noblest name connected with the see of Worcester is Latimer, and he was the son of a yeoman. Dr. George Bull, the most distinguished Bishop of St. David's, was the son of a tradesman of Wells. Two Archbishops, Laud and Tillotson, were sons of clothiers. Another Archbishop, Parker, was the son of a Norwich calender of stuffs. Bishop Pearce's father was a distiller in Holborn. The father of Launcelot Andrews, Bishop of Winchester, was a sailor. Bishop Berkeley's father performed the humble duties of collector of the town of Belfast. Simon Patrick, Bishop of Ely, was the son of a Gainsborough mercer; Bishop Smalridge, of a dyer of Lichfield; and Bishop Newton, of a cyder and brandy merchant of the same town. The greatest ornament of the Irish Church, Jeremy Taylor (like one of our late Judges), was the son of a barber of Cambridge. Three distinguished Prelates—Tillotson, Butler and Secker—sprang from parents who were not only of humble rank, but were avowed Nonconformists. The same may, we believe, be said respecting at least one Irish Archbishop. The able Prelate who in the last century originated the Bangorian controversy, Dr. Benjamin Hoadly, like some others who have won a mitre, was the son of a schoolmaster. And precisely similar was the origin of the remarkable man whose *Memoirs* now claim, and on many accounts well deserve, our attention.

Charles James Blomfield was born, May 29, 1786, in the quiet but pleasant town of Bury St. Edmunds. The two Christian names given him at a time when the great opposition statesman was so prominently before the public, might lead to the conjecture that the father of the future Bishop was in politics a Foxite. But, in fact, the names were family names,—Charles, that of his father; James, that of his grandfather. The last-named person had removed from his native place, Ousden, in Suffolk, to Bury, where he was at the head of a boarding-house, established for the reception of scholars who could not be received at the grammar-school of the town. With that school (one of the numerous foundations of Edward VI.) both the Blomfields were successively connected as teachers of writing and arithmetic. In the *Memoir* before us there is a little mystification respecting the school kept by the father, and before his time by the grandfather, of the Bishop. At the best, the establishment kept by the Blomfields was a kind of preparatory school, as well as a boarding-house connected with the grammar-school. Carlisle, in his account, says: "Nearly the whole of these boys (*viz.* the boys at Blomfield's boarding-house) receive classical instruction at the grammar-school, and the two establishments are so closely connected as almost to be considered as one."

One branch of the family of Charles Blomfield was connected with Protestant Nonconformity. Mr. Pawsey, uncle of the Bishop, was to the close of life a steady supporter of the old Dissenting congregation of the town. The circumstance is of course too unimportant to be mentioned in the Memoir.

Charles James Blomfield honourably won the distinction of being the founder of the fortunes of his family; and this he did by his unflinching industry and the resolute application of his admirable talents to the duty which lay before him. His early advantages did not surpass those enjoyed by hundreds of English boys in the lower middle rank, having access to a respectable grammar-school. After learning from his father the rudiments of the Latin tongue, he entered, when eight years of age, the public school. The head master in 1794 was Mr. Michael Thos. Becher, Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. He had the reputation of being an accurate and elegant scholar, and the school flourished under his care, there being in it from 70 to 100 pupils. The statutes ordained that the best Greek and Latin authors should be taught in the school, "and nothing else." Subsequently, instruction in mathematics and other branches of useful knowledge has been, on a revision of the statutes, admitted. The system of the school resembled that of Eton College. Some fair scholars and several successful ecclesiastics—Archbishop San-croft, Bishops Thurlow and Tomline, Richard Cumberland, Christopher Anstey and General Lee—had passed through the school. Never probably did a more resolute and ambitious pupil enter within its walls than Charles James Blomfield. His declaration as a child, when asked what his future calling was to be, was—"I mean to be a Bishop." Among his companions at the school were the late Baron Alderson and Lord Cranworth.

"A delicate boy at first, and subject to affections of the chest, for which the air of Bury was too keen, Charles James used to climb up the stairs by the help of the banisters, and on account of his diminutive size was nicknamed by his schoolfellows *Tit* Blomfield. But he gave early promise of the ability and industry which marked his whole subsequent life. During the ten years which he spent at the Grammar School, he would often rise at four or five in the morning, in order to study modern languages, botany, and chemistry, in addition to his regular school-work. His verses and school exercises acquired him a reputation among his compeers; and those more serious compositions were diversified by vernacular poems on the incidents of school life; a kind of amusement in which he continued to indulge occasionally to the last. * * *

"In his own home he was an affectionate and lively companion to a large family of brothers and sisters, all younger than himself. An electrical machine of his own making—poetry also of his own making, highly admired by the home audience—plays acted with schoolfellows of his own age, and music, were among the diversions of his holidays."

I. 2, 3.

His father at the close of the century proposed removing him to Eton, and with a view to this change he was examined; but though actually admitted as a King's scholar, he never went, his father not approving some things he saw there.

In 1804, his university life began, and he entered Trinity College, Cambridge, as a pensioner. The early days of a poor scholar at the university are sufficiently lonely and painful, even if there be not added to other discomforts that of a wretched lodging out of college. Charles James Blomfield had in his first year the annoyance of rooms at a tailor's under his noisy workshop, and close to a day-school kept by the tailor's wife. The head of his college, Dr. Mansel (afterwards Bishop of Bristol), received him graciously and promised to be "a father to him;" but as the master never afterwards took any notice of him, the ideas of parental care entertained by that official must have been singular. Fortunately some old schoolfellows were more kind, and asked him to join a society which they had formed for social intercourse, called the "Bury Club."

The indefatigable industry with which he pursued his studies at the university marked his resolute ambition.

"The boys of Charterhouse and Eton were more than a match for the best scholar of Bury in some important parts of scholarship. Accordingly he began a system of reading which overtasked his bodily, though not his mental powers, and the bad effects of which lasted perhaps throughout his life. During the first four months of his residence at Cambridge, he read through Aristophanes, all the Greek tragedians, Herodotus, Thucydides, and a great part of Cicero, spending sometimes sixteen or even eighteen hours out of the twenty-four over his books. He wrote every day a piece of Greek or Latin composition, and a translation from a Greek or Latin author, which latter he translated back again some days after, and then compared his version with the original. He had no private tutor, but at the end of his first academical year he was fortunately introduced to Mr., afterwards Bishop Maltby, who was then residing at Buckden in Huntingdonshire, and taking pupils. Maltby, with much kindness, seeing in his young friend the promise of much classical eminence, took him into his house as one of his pupils, for six weeks, without payment, and gave him some good advice as to the method of reading he should pursue; his previous work had been too rapid; he had neglected commentators, and had not written notes of his own."—I. 4, 5.

His first college honour was a scholarship. In 1805, he gained Browne's prize for a Latin ode. Success only stimulated him to further efforts.

"He now recommenced reading on the improved plan recommended by Mr. Maltby. His day was generally thus divided. Rising in time for the early chapel service, which he never missed during his undergraduate life, except when prevented by illness, he began reading at nine; at twelve, allowed himself two hours' recreation, walking, or rowing, or occasionally a game of billiards; dined at two, the college dinner

hour; and, returning to his books at three, read without intermission till twelve at night, and occasionally till three in the morning. Sometimes he alternated his work, one week sitting up till three, and the next rising at four. The remonstrances of friends or physicians, who warned him that he read too hard, were in vain; the objects which he had set before him must be gained at whatever cost of ease, time, and health. Of his industry at this period some proofs still remain in the shape of very elaborate note-books, written with that calligraphy which scholars had not yet learnt to despise. A Bury friend meeting him in the streets of Cambridge in a long vacation, exclaimed, 'Why, Charles Blomfield, I believe if you were to drop from the sky, you would be found with a book in your hand.'—I. 5, 6.

The small portion of time which he gave to society was devoted to the company of such men as Alderson, Pollock, Sharpe, Hustler and Rennell. To this list we may add the name of James Henry Monk, afterwards his companion in episcopal rank and also misfortune, both being made objects of the mocking wit of the naughty Prebendary of St. Paul's in his celebrated *Letters to Archdeacon Singleton*.*

His classical proficiency was marked in 1806 by his gaining the Craven University scholarship and the prize for the Greek ode. The former of these academic triumphs was still further sweetened by a compliment from Porson, the examining Professor, who, pleased with his adding to his translation of a difficult and corrupt chorus in *Æschylus* Porson's proposed emendations of the text, remarked that he "was a very pretty scholar." But, as a Cambridge man, he felt constrained to turn his thoughts to mathematics. This branch of study, though discountenanced by his master at Bury, had not been entirely neglected by him. He now devoted his whole strength to it, and had the benefit of his friend Pollock's advice and assistance, who was an accomplished mathematician, Blomfield in his turn helping the other in classics. His industry gained for him a place as third wrangler, Lord Langdale and Mr. Bland being above him, and Mr. Sedgwick just below him. The Chancellor's Classical Medal and the Members' Prize for a Latin essay, together with a Fellowship at Trinity, completed the not short list of his academical honours. Nor were they barren honours; for he was enabled by their proceeds for the most part to support himself during his residence at Cambridge. His studies had been too severe and protracted for his health. For a long time he suffered from indigestion. His nervous system was for years so shaken, that "he could not ride on horseback without having to dismount at the slightest alarm, and cling for support to a tree or railing until the nervous tremor had passed off."

Sydney Smith recommended Jeffrey, then editor of the *Edin-*

* The story of Simon of *Gloucester's* shrewd counsel to the Bishops at Dordrecht, which Sydney Smith affected to have picked up in an old Dutch chronicle, is one of those witty parables which will live with the English language.

burgh Review, to admit Blomfield into his regiment of literary sharp-shooters. The advice was taken, and the young Cambridge scholar selected Butler, of Shrewsbury, who had just published an edition of *Æschylus*, as his mark. He contributed two articles to the Review, which were sufficiently learned and acute to provoke Butler (who replied in an angry pamphlet) and his friend Parr. Blomfield was of the "Porsonian party," and the other side accused him and them of "pretentious arrogance."

The year 1810 was a memorable one in his life, for in the course of it he was ordained curate, and entered in that capacity on the parochial duties of Chesterford; then took priest's orders from the hands of Bishop Mansel; was presented by Lord Bristol, his own and his father's patron, to the living of Quarrington, in Lincolnshire; and married a Norfolk lady. As there was no parsonage-house at Quarrington, he continued to reside at Chesterford. He thus at the very beginning of his clerical life belonged to the class of non-resident clergy against whom he afterwards waged a war of extermination. At Chesterford he had at this time the pleasure of the society of Mr. Eustace, a Catholic priest, whose scholarly accomplishments were disclosed in his well-known "*Classical Tour*." At this time Mr. Blomfield was moderately liberal in his views; was in favour of the Catholic claims; but we shall presently have to mark a change in this matter. Some of his associates and friends, such as Maltby, Parr and Lord Spencer, were thoroughly liberal politicians, and may for a time have exercised some influence over him. In 1811, he was presented by the nobleman just mentioned to the living of Dunton, in Buckinghamshire. He was enabled to retain Quarrington, and was thus a pluralist as well as a non-resident. For six years he lived in this secluded Buckinghamshire village, and was little distracted from classical studies and tutorial duties by parochial cares.

"His parishioners were seventy-two in number; his clerk was an old *woman* between seventy and eighty, who could not read, and who, when she stole the Communion plate of the church, took it to the nearest pawnbroker, in ignorance that the name of the parish was engraved in conspicuous letters upon it. The neighbours were few and far between, though hospitable, and the roads, when he first went there, almost impassable. There was however a tolerable parsonage, in which he could accommodate his pupils; and his reputation as a scholar being now pretty widely known, many noblemen were anxious to place their sons under his care—among them, Earl Spencer, Lords Ashburnham, Colchester, and Lilford, the Duke of Beaufort, and the second Marquis, afterwards Duke, of Buckingham. 'I cannot satisfy myself,' writes a parent of his son, 'with any arrangement for him which promises inferior advantages, so long as I can entertain the hope of placing him with you.' Indeed, his character as a private tutor had now become so established, that he was enabled to raise his terms, which had at first been only £150 or £200, to £300, or even £400 a year."—I. 21, 22.

But one recommendation Dunton had which a clergyman always desiderates. There was not a single Dissenter in the place to flout by his disagreeable presence the rector's conscious dignity as sole guardian of the people's spiritual interests.

The year before he had begun to edit *Æschylus*. This task he continued at intervals till its completion in 1824. His work was commended in both the great Reviews, especially in the *Edinburgh Review* by Elmsley. On the other hand, Hermann, the noted German scholar, professed to find in this *Æschylus* "a great arbitrariness of proceeding and much boldness of innovation, guided by no sure principle." The biographer admits that his father's edition of these Greek plays has, by the labours of subsequent editors, become "a book of comparatively small value." He also took part with Monk, Tate, Parr and other Cambridge scholars, in the *Museum Criticum*. To the *Quarterly* he at this time contributed a pungent review of the early numbers of Valpy's edition of Stephens' *Greek Thesaurus*.

"This work, for which Valpy procured 1100 subscribers, had enveloped the original Stephens (himself of no meagre bulk) in such a mass of ill-digested and irrelevant commentation, that the Reviewer calculated, that if it were continued on the plan on which it had been begun, it would fill fifty volumes, consume seventy years in publication, and cost 400 guineas to the large-paper and 200 guineas to the small-paper contributors; and as the *vita summa brevis* forbade the hope of outliving this Nestor of Lexicons, their interest in its unborn numbers might be an appropriate subject of testamentary dispositions. For this article Mr. Murray, the publisher of the *Quarterly*, sent him 100 guineas; and Lord Stowell told him that the subscribers to the *Thesaurus* ought to have presented him with a piece of plate, for having brought the work to an abrupt termination, and thereby saved their pockets."—I. 27.

The article, however, not unnaturally drew down on Mr. Blomfield's head the wrath of Barker, the editor, whose angry pamphlet, entitled "*Aristarchus Anti-Blomfieldianus*," abounded in those flowers of literary vituperation which, though amusing to one class of readers, are discreditable to a scholar and a gentleman. At an early period he terminated his career as a reviewer. With the *Edinburgh* he broke off all connection as early as 1815, finding something in the work which offended his orthodoxy or his delicate clerical sense of propriety. His son admits that he can find nothing in Jeffrey's *Review* that deserved moral censure. But, in fact, the future Bishop was rapidly purging himself of any liberal tendencies which Cambridge and his associates there may have encouraged. He was, while at Dunton, appointed a magistrate, and took his share of magisterial work at the petty sessions at Wing, thus adding in his own early clerical life another function which as a Bishop he disapproved and put his ponderous heel upon. He now began, or if he had previously begun resumed, the studies proper to his profession.

"Besides his unremitting attention to his pupils, it was at Dunton that he laid the foundation of his solid theological acquirements. Patristic divinity was not at that time very much studied: he read, however, to a considerable extent in that department; and with the writings of the masters of English theology, and of the principal commentators on Holy Scripture, he made himself thoroughly acquainted."—I. 38.

While at Dunton, he preached and published one or two sermons. A visitation sermon is thus described by himself in a letter to a correspondent:

"Taking for my text Heb. xiii. 17, I shortly consider the divine appointment of the ministry, and dwell upon the pastoral *responsibility* mentioned in the above passage, as a strong argument in favour of the office being confined to those who are regularly entrusted with it, and on the correlative duties of obedience and adherence to the regular ministry, and of a faithful discharge of the pastoral duties; of forbearing to distract people's faith by preaching doctrines of dubious foundation and ambiguous tendency, whether inclining to Socinianism or Calvinism, and the danger of departing from the line of doctrine laid down in the ordinances of the Church."—I. 42, 43.

A more valuable sermon was one preached by him, 1817, "on the importance of a knowledge of Jewish tradition to the interpreter of Scripture; a subject which he handled more fully in a 'Dissertation upon the Traditional Knowledge of a promised Redeemer.'"

On this publication Bishop Kaye well remarked:

"You have reminded our Cambridge divines of a principle of interpretation to which too little attention has been paid; but the truth is that our pious theologians dislike all principles, the application of which is to cost them any trouble; they prefer the short cut, and would persuade us that human industry is not only unnecessary but prejudicial to the right understanding of the Scriptures. You must not, therefore, expect their approbation."—I. 46.

The sermon also elicited a handsome letter, in his own emphatic style, from Dr. Parr, beginning: "Dear, excellent, learned, and deeply respected Mr. Blomfield."

While at Dunton, a sorrow came over his house by the death of his brother Edward, his companion at the university and a scholar of great promise.

In 1817, Mr. Blomfield again appears in the character of a pluralist, receiving in that year from the Earl of Bristol the valuable livings of Great and Little Chesterford, and of Tudenham, in Suffolk. It was soon after Mr. Blomfield's appointment to this living that he lost his wife, who had been long in delicate health, and of whose six children only one survived infancy.

"Bishop Blomfield is still remembered at Chesterford for his activity and benevolence. He took a more prominent part in parochial business, and in the administration of local charities, than was then usual among the clergy; so that one of his parishioners described his energy in a

farmer's simile, 'I call him Mr. Snap-trace.' He visited the poor, one of whom described him afterwards as 'a wonderful forgiving gentleman;' he superintended the schools, which had been improved by Mr. Davys; he saw that the public-houses were closed in good time at night; he improved the vicarage grounds by planting, and buying up the adjoining slips of land; and he continued, as before, to devote much of his time to study, and to the pupils whom he received into his parsonage.

"One circumstance which at that time tended to mar a clergyman's usefulness in the parish of Chesterford, and to lower the moral tone of its inhabitants, was this. The village lay upon the high road between London and Newmarket, and the frequenters of the Races at the latter place always stopped to change horses and refresh themselves at the large inn near the church. This in itself was undesirable; but to make matters worse, at that time the first day of the Newmarket Spring Meeting was Easter Monday, and those who were to be present passed through Chesterford on Easter Day. The country people from the neighbouring villages flocked in to see the gentlefolks pass in their carriages, and a regular fair, with its apparatus of booths, was held on the open space in front of the inn: and while the vicar was celebrating the Eucharist in the adjoining church, on the most sacred day of the Christian year, the aristocratic sportsmen would drive up to the inn in open carriages, playing at whist, and throwing out their cards, would call to the waiters for fresh packs. To quote the words which Bishop Blomfield himself used some years later, 'More than forty pairs of horses have sometimes been changed there on Easter Day, a great proportion of them while I was celebrating Divine Service. Not only all the servants and dependents of the inn, but a great number of the young men of the parish, were taken away from their own Sabbath duties, to assist in this flagrant violation of them by others; not to mention that hundreds were engaged in observing their betters thus ostentatiously setting at nought the ordinances of religion; some urging with bribes, and others with execrations, the drivers of those poor jaded animals, for whom the merciful provision of a Sabbath seemed almost to have been made in vain; while others were seen engaged in gambling, and scattering the implements of their unholy pastime about the road.'

"He had endeavoured, though unsuccessfully, when curate of the parish, to remove or mitigate this scandal; and when he returned as vicar he renewed his remonstrances to the Jockey Club, which were now backed by his neighbour, the then Lord Braybrooke. The influential patrons of the turf were at first very unwilling to make any change. Bishop Howley addressed the Duke of York on the subject; but the Duke declined to alter his practice, and said, that though it was true he travelled to the races on Sunday, he always had a Bible and Prayer Book in the carriage. Eventually, however, the first day of the races was changed from Monday to Tuesday."—I. 53—55.

We have in this Memoir a deplorable, but probably not inaccurate, picture of the working of the Church system in the last century and the early years of the present. More than half the benefices in England were in the possession of non-resident clergymen, the duties often performed in a slovenly fashion by curates, upon a large proportion of whom the two stimulants of hope and

fear, the hope of promotion or the fear of episcopal or public censure, had little influence. All that was absolutely demanded of a clergyman was a decent and regular performance of divine service on Sundays. As to their occupations for the rest of the week, the clergy might hunt, shoot, fish, attend to their farm, frequent Tory clubs, or, in short, do what they pleased. There was little intellectual cultivation, little care for the Church as a means of religious and spiritual improvement, and a stolid indifference to public opinion. The biographer accounts for this state of things in part by the strong conservative feeling engendered in England by the French Revolution, "which clung to things as they were because they were so; upheld the rights while it repudiated the duties of property, and stigmatized reform as sedition and earnestness as enthusiasm." In the same strain Bishop Copleston, speaking of High-churchmen in 1814, said: "The leading partizans who assume that title appear to me to be only occupied with the thought of converting the property of the Church to their private advantage, leaving the duties of it to be performed as they can." The social position of the inferior clergy was low and despised. Patronage was carelessly given or shamelessly bartered. Bishops and their examining chaplains were indifferent and lax in requirements previous to ordination.

"The chaplain and son-in-law of Bishop North (1781—1820) examined two candidates for orders in a tent on a cricket-field, he himself being engaged as one of the players. Bishop Pelham (1807—1827) performed the same duty on one occasion by sending a message by his butler to the candidate to write an essay; the chaplain of Bishop Douglas (1787—1807) did it while shaving, and stopped the examination when the examinee had construed two words. The laxity of Bishop Bathurst, of Norwich (1805—1837), known to his Whig admirers as 'the good bishop,' with regard to ordinations, is well known, and involved him in a misunderstanding with Dr. Blomfield when Bishop of Chester. The natural consequence of this state of things was a very low standard of theological acquirements among the country clergy."—I. 59, 60.

And here is the not flattering portrait of the members of the hierarchy:

"The Bishops, though numbering some men of superior stamp among them, and as a body decorous in private character, were often either politically subservient, avaricious, courtiers, domineering, or neglectful of their dioceses. Indeed, measured by the standard of our own days, even the best would be considered as deficient in some parts of his office. Bishop Porteous (1776—1809) was justly honoured as an amiable and conscientious prelate; yet, when asked by a neighbouring clergyman to preach a charity sermon for him, he could reply, 'I only give one in a year, and the next year is promised.'"—I. 60, 61.

Some of Mr. Blomfield's readers, while thankful to him for his love of truth and moral courage in thus describing the Church of England as it existed half a century ago, may be disposed to

draw conclusions from his statements which he may resent. They may see in his narrative the natural consequences of a Church establishment, and especially of one in which the working clergy are shut out from any considerable portion of the Church's wealth, and the people are denied a voice in all ecclesiastical arrangements. He traces some of the evils of which he complains to what he calls the "legacy of the Reformation," viz., benefices inadequately endowed. Churchmen, high and low, have always one nostrum for every social disease—"More churches and a better-paid clergy." A wiser prescription would perhaps be, "Less Churchism and more religion."

The biographer before us has of course been led to describe the unhealthy state of religion in England at the time when his father began clerical life, in order to magnify his services as a Church reformer. It would be an act of injustice to deny him this character. His example as a working clergyman, and afterwards his authority and influence as a Bishop, and the most resolute and practical member of the English hierarchy in his day, undoubtedly did much to put down improprieties, to improve the order and decency of Church services, and to give sobriety and system to clerical life. But the more we realize what he was as a clergyman and what he did in the direction of Church reform, the more are we disposed to question his enlarged wisdom and to regret the almost uncontrolled influence he acquired. He was a zealous ritualist. He would govern a Church establishment as he would manage a large school, by laws and regulations never to be departed from. Obedience to Bishops, conformity to rubrics, the unhesitating assertion of every dogma, of each and every article and creed,—this was Blomfield's beau-ideal of the perfection of a church. Himself gifted with an amazing amount of practical skill and talents for organization, and destitute of that metaphysical insight which gives rise to speculation and raises doubts, he demanded from the clergy unhesitating obedience and a perfectly submissive faith. He had no sympathy whatever with intellectual difficulties and moral scruples. Clergymen that swerved from the line of Church orthodoxy, whether from looking to Calvin on one side or Socinus on the other, were in his eyes guilty of a kind of clerical treason. He did not stop to consider what the nature or consequences of their individual speculations might be; it was enough for him to reprobate them that they were departures from Church allegiance. He looked with scarcely less dislike on practical innovations. A clergyman that attended a meeting of the Bible Society, or any other society not strictly Church in its organization, or one giving in to extempore prayer and preaching, or introducing a hymn-book on which the Ordinary had not stamped his approving mark, or allowing his pulpit and church to be used in furthering religious and charitable objects not distinctly recognized by the Church,—

was an offender to be dealt with without mercy. A good story relating to his life at Little Chesterford, told for a different purpose, may serve to illustrate the precision of his practice.

"Walking over one Sunday to his duty at Little Chesterford, he found on his arrival that he had forgotten to bring his sermon with him. It was too late to return: so, for the first and only time in his life, he preached *ex tempore*, taking for his text the first verse of the fifty-third Psalm, 'The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God.' Being anxious to know how he had seemed to succeed in an unaccustomed effort, he asked one of the congregation on coming out, how he had liked the sermon. 'Well, Mr. Blomfield,' replied the man, 'I liked the sermon well enough; but I can't say I agree with you; I think there *be* a God.'"—I. 55.

Now when it is remembered that Dr. Blomfield was one of the most gifted and ready speakers of his age,—one who could with the slightest premeditation rise and deliver on some important subject an elaborate speech in the House of Lords, and begin and finish his harangue without a tremor or a moment's hesitation,—never recalling a word, never uttering a sentiment he cared to retract or modify,—it must strike one as most extraordinary that he never but on this occasion exercised his power of extempore utterance in the pulpit. It cannot be doubted that he lost thereby some valuable opportunities, and was far less useful than he might have been as a preacher. But to preach extempore was in his eyes foreign to the use of his Church, and might seem to countenance the spirit of enthusiasm often found in the "Evangelical" school, which he thought not compatible with strict clerical discipline. To his general policy as a Church reformer when raised to the bench of Bishops, we shall have occasion again to refer.

At Chesterford, Mr. Blomfield received Lord Hervey, the son and heir of the Earl of Bristol (the Marquisate in that family dates 1826), as a pupil. The Earl was brother-in-law of the Prime Minister, Lord Liverpool, and his good word was the means of obtaining the valuable and important city benefice of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate. It was actually the gift of the Archbishop of Canterbury. Dr. Howley gracefully carried out the purpose of the Prime Minister, who, mistakenly thinking the benefice was in the gift of the Crown, had nominated Mr. Blomfield. He was again a pluralist, retaining Chesterford with the London living. His preferment was preceded by his second marriage (to a widow lady), and was followed by his taking up at Cambridge, by virtue of a Royal letter, the degree of Doctor in Divinity.

He was now possessed of an ample income, with means of influence and usefulness not less extensive. The duty of a city parish with a population exceeding 10,000, to which he devoted himself with the thoroughness that was his characteristic, proved a ser-

viceable preparation for the higher duties to which he was presently to be called. It has sometimes been made a question, and on which contradictory opinions have been offered, whether a parish priest or a clergyman who has given himself up to the duties of a school or a college, is the more likely to make a good Bishop. Dr. Blomfield's career gave him something of the advantages of both,—the habit of organization and command which a school-master's position gives, and the wider knowledge of human nature and familiarity with public business which the minister of a parish acquires.

The narrative which the biographer gives of his father's indefatigable and successful performance of parochial duty is very interesting. The position of a clergyman gifted with talents, character and fortune, is one that gives him almost boundless influence. A few hours devoted twice or thrice a week to house-to-house visiting enables him to become personally acquainted with most of his parishioners. He is looked up to as the first man in the district; and even to Dissenters, if his manners are conciliatory and genial, his visits are generally welcome. He takes at once and as a right that which the Dissenting minister desirous of pastoral usefulness has to gain by slow degrees. He can do in a morning as much as the other, whose people are perhaps scattered over a wide district, can do in a week. It is, indeed, not easy to overrate the advantages of the parochial system of England, in respect to pastoral influence, the diffusion of education and the working of charitable institutions. If the clergy really knew all their advantages and would put aside priestly pretensions, and would treat all around them kindly as fellow-men and fellow-christians, they would soon empty half the meeting-houses in their parishes; and, better still, would be centres of moral and religious influence radiating far beyond the boundaries of the parish.

Some of his published sermons at this time claim attention. A discourse against the Calvinistic Doctrine of Election and Reprobation enunciates a principle of interpretation of wider application than the author probably designed: "Where the Gospel is plain and precise, and the Epistles obscure and perplexing, the Epistles are to be interpreted according to the Gospels, not the Gospels according to the Epistles." How many favourite textual arguments often plied in controversy with Unitarians would this sensible rule put aside!

A year or two before Dr. Blomfield became rector of St. Botolph's, Mr. W. J. Fox had commenced his brilliant career as a Unitarian preacher, first in Artillery Lane and afterwards at South Place, Finsbury. His eloquence attracted crowded audiences, especially to his lectures, which he described as "speeches to set people thinking." One series of lectures, embracing such subjects as Church-of-Englandism, Religious Liberty

and Unitarianism, was published in 1819, and quickly ran through two editions. The rector of St. Botolph's, being in the habit of preaching courses of lectures at the season of Lent, took in hand, in 1825, "The Gospel of St. John as bearing Testimony to the Divinity of our Saviour." By "divinity," the rector intended to express the deity of Christ. The five lectures were published, and designed to counteract the influence of Mr. Fox's writings and lectures. They are respectable, but rather commonplace performances, such as any orthodox clergyman might have preached; but neither in learning nor in argument do they add an iota to the familiar arguments for the deity of Christ. Mr. Fox immediately accepted the challenge thus publicly given, and in a letter addressed to the author of the lectures essayed the proof that the apostle John was an Unitarian. The letter was an admirable specimen of controversial writing, respectful in tone, candid in spirit, close in its logic, from first to last scriptural in its proofs. The Unitarians were well satisfied with their champion, and his letter has to this day continued a favourite tract amongst them for popular use. The rector did not reply. But when, in 1828, he preached and published an extensive course of lectures on the Acts of the Apostles, he reprinted in the Appendix his lectures on the Gospel of St. John. In handling the doctrinal part of the book of Acts, he had been constrained to admit the absence from the sermons of the apostles of some of the distinctive doctrines of the orthodox system, and the publication might seem to him to require an orthodox make-weight. We may here mention the only considerable theological publication by Dr. Blomfield, a selection from his Bishopsgate sermons, a volume printed in 1829. One of the sermons explains his views of the Athanasian Creed. While he pleads for the retention in the services of the Church of this symbol as a necessary and explicit statement of orthodox doctrine, he shrinks from the defence of the damnatory clauses of the Creed. The position of an amiable but orthodox clergyman in this matter is sufficiently embarrassing, and rather than blame the contradictoriness or cloudiness of his opinions, we are, in truth, disposed to admire the amiability which induces a man thus circumstanced to resort (as the late Mr. Robertson, of Brighton, did, and as Mr. Maurice and Dr. Stanley do) to the most forced and non-natural interpretations of the damnatory clauses of the Creed. In a letter which Dr. Blomfield addressed to a former pupil, who, under the influence of scruples in relation to this symbol of faith, thought of leaving the ministry of the Church, we find some amusing specimens of inconsistency. In one passage he says—

"It is certain that whatever the true faith be, it is necessary to salvation as far as we can determine. And if the Christian faith be rightly set forth in the Athanasian Creed, the Church has a right to say that the belief of the doctrines therein contained is necessary to salvation—

provided that this be said with those implied limitations, with which equity and the Scripture teach us that all such declarations must be fenced and qualified."—I. 115, 116.

Again, in another passage, he says that the Creed was "rendered necessary by the subtilities of some early heretics;" but he does not deny that it may be considered "as an attempt to define what is undefinable by human language." This concession is one of far-reaching consequence; for as language is in man's present state the only medium through which theological doctrine can be presented to the mind, it surely follows that that which cannot be definitely presented cannot be definitely believed. But Dr. Blomfield goes on to point out, in fact, the inconsistency of some of the Articles of his Church with this noted Creed.

"With respect to all its doctrines, the language of a true Protestant Church is that which our own Church distinctly holds in her Articles [quoting from Articles vi. xvii. and xxi.]. Now I consider it evident upon the face of it that a Church which holds such language as this can never intend to pronounce sentence of condemnation (or rather to declare that sentence will be given) against those who do not implicitly admit the minute dogmatical *illustrations* of a doctrine which she herself has laid down, as fully and particularly as she requires it to be believed in her first five Articles. In those Articles no such sentence is passed even by implication."—I. 115.

The letter closes thus:

"I think it a supposition so probable, that I have no hesitation in adopting it, that whereas the Eighth Article declares that the three Creeds may be proved by Scripture, it means, strictly and properly, the *doctrine* of those creeds. Now the damnable clauses are no part of the *Christian doctrine* set forth in that Creed, nor even, strictly speaking, part of the Creed itself; but a particular form of asserting that the doctrine of the Creed is true; as if you were to subjoin to the Apostles' Creed some such clause as this—'This is the true Catholic faith,' no one would look upon it as part of the Creed. Taking then into account the uniform moderation and wariness of our Church in dogmatizing; the unvarying language which her most eminent divines have held respecting the restricted import of the condemning clauses; the formal (but by accident not official) exposition of the Church itself by its commissioned interpreters in 1689; the admission of the most scrupulous and captious Baxter that such exposition may be received; and the undoubted fact that when you subscribe the Eighth Article, you are considered to subscribe it in this sense and no other (and that too a sense perfectly consisting with 'the literal and grammatical sense')—surely it is symptomatic rather of pride or weakness than of a conscientious sincerity, to persist in affixing your own sense to the Article, rather than that in which every authority deserving of respect assures you that you may and ought to take it. And if you object, that although you may yourself use the Athanasian Creed with this qualifying exposition of the condemning clauses, the people will not know that they are to be so qualified, the obvious answer is, 'Then take care to inform them.'"—I. 116.

Now it is obvious that if the Creed sets forth in its substance

only true doctrine, and if the reception of true doctrine is essential to salvation, then in strict logic the introductory clauses of the Creed are justified. The attempt to draw a line between the doctrine of the Creed and its damnatory clauses is not to be vindicated. The Creed, as given in the Book of Common Prayer, teaches the damnability of such as do not believe the Trinity, as unequivocally as it teaches that doctrine. And what is *doctrine* but *the thing taught*? In truth, Churchmen, having too much good-nature to say without hesitation that their Unitarian relative or neighbour shall without doubt perish everlastingly, had best honestly join in Archbishop Tillotson's wish that they were "well rid" of the Athanasian Creed, and take the first opportunity, whether "in times of quiet and peace" or of storm and trouble, of consigning it to disuse and forgottenness.

To return, however, to matters of fact. It had now become plain that Dr. Blomfield was a man destined for the highest offices of his Church. In every position he made his power and readiness and tact instantly felt, and the Church from various causes needed able defenders. The next step in the ladder of ecclesiastical promotion was his appointment by the Primate to the Archdeaconry of Colchester, an office once held by Beveridge, an ecclesiastic whom Churchmen are wont to praise as "the great reviver and restorer of primitive piety."

The comfort of some of the clergy of Essex was probably not much promoted by the charge of the new Archdeacon, when, aspiring somewhat higher than rebuking negligent churchwardens and parishioners careless, in their dread of a heavy rate, of the fabric of the church, he told them he would strictly enforce the repairing of glebe-houses by non-resident incumbents, and that it was a function of his office, which he intended to fulfil, to detect unto the Bishop all ecclesiastical irregularities.

Notwithstanding his multiplied duties, he still found time to contribute to the Quarterly Review and other periodicals. An article on Predestination won for him from Bishop Kaye the praise of being calculated to soften "the asperities of the disputants of both sides," and as "shewing them the peculiar propriety of speaking temperately and diffidently on subjects on which men of the acutest understandings have been guilty of false reasoning."

Dr. Blomfield put out in 1823 an anonymous pamphlet in defence of the Church and Churchmen, entitled "A Remonstrance addressed to H. Brougham, Esq., by one of the Working Clergy." The prosecution for libel at Durham instituted by the clergy of that diocese, and various other circumstances, had at this time roused a considerable amount of anti-church feeling, which had found powerful expression in the Edinburgh Review and the Morning Chronicle. The Archbishop of Canterbury had been in the former work denounced as the enemy of popular

education. His administration of the Church was wretchedly feeble. His whole policy was to do little himself, and to hinder, when he quietly could, the activity of other men. Dr. Blomfield pelts the assailants of the Church with some vituperation both in Greek and in the vernacular. The point of the passages admirably quoted by his son is, that the assailants of the Church were animated more by the desire of benefiting themselves by plunder than serving the public. Mr. Brougham is tauntingly told that when the fall of the Church is secured, he may possibly carry off as his share of the booty "an estate or two from some other northern diocese." Such a rejoinder may fall in with the tastes and prejudices of the clerical order, but it is unworthy of notice. If the biographer of Dr. Blomfield had been a layman and a man of the world, this piece of clerical scolding would, we think, have been allowed to remain in its anonymous and deserved obscurity.

As he ascended towards the hierarchy, Dr. Blomfield was invited to take his share in the management of the powerful charitable and educational organizations which are conducted in the metropolis in a very exclusive spirit, and in accordance with what are called Church principles. The faint liberalism which he had imbibed at Cambridge was now rapidly disappearing. His High-church associates of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and other similar charities found in him little which they would desire to alter. He had receded from the support of the Catholic claims, and in respect to mixed education his views were approaching those of the High-church party. Liberalism is in truth a dress in which an ecclesiastic of rank sits with little comfort and with a constant sense of awkwardness.

The wishes and anticipations of his friends had for some years invested the head of Dr. Blomfield with the mitre. They were at length, by the death of the Bishop of Bath and Wells and the translation of Dr. Law from Chester to Bath, fulfilled. In May, 1824, the offer of the see of Chester came to him from Lord Liverpool. There were difficulties in the way. The Bishopric offered him was at that time the most laborious, extensive and ill-paid in the kingdom. The palace at Chester was a dismal abode, more like a prison than a nobleman's mansion; the society in the city and county had little that was congenial to the tastes of a scholar; and four-and-twenty hours of tedious travelling then separated Cheshire from London.

A letter from his friend Lady Spencer holds her up as a very shrewd prophetess of good things to come.

"'My dear Doctor,' she writes, 'I hope I need not tell you that I trust I shall soon have to shake you by the hand as Bishop of Chester. Don't be so indiscreet as to refuse it because it is a sadly poor one—remember it is the step which you must tread on to a richer one. All the old twaddles have dropped—young ones don't depart so readily;

and I am myself so old that I am impatient to see you seated on that bench, where you will be so admirably placed, and so usefully disposed of. If the Metropolitan is translated, which his looks portend, the Bishop of London replaces him; and who so likely as yourself, with all your London knowledge and experience, to be the Bishop of this diocese, if you *are* on the bench—but then you must be, or my plan can't take place. Seriously, Lord Spencer and I are all on tiptoe to hear of your acceptance; for, though it may be present ruin, yet it will be *soon* future affluence. And why should you not keep your St. Botolph?"—I. 93, 94.

He was allowed to hold his valuable London living *in commendam* with the Bishopric. He received consecration, June 20, 1824, from the hands of the venerable Archbishop of York and the Bishops of London and Exeter, and the sermon on the occasion was preached by his friend Dr. Lonsdale, destined afterwards to ascend to a similar distinction. So popular and successful had been Dr. Blomfield's parochial administration, that there was general satisfaction at his promotion to the Bench. It was a rare thing to see a clergyman under forty years of age on the Episcopal Bench, and great hopes were founded on the well-known energy of the new Prelate.

Dr. Parr joined in the general acclamation, and promised to "fill and empty two bumpers" in his honour,—a promise which we dare say he faithfully fulfilled.

The first ecclesiastical reform which he attempted was to obtain from the Head of the Church a dispensation from wearing the wig, which to *hot-headed* men must have been an intolerable burthen. But that "most religious" monarch, George IV., had his scruples on this and other points. In snuff and wigs his taste was unimpeachable and his knowledge profound. This indulgence to episcopal weakness was therefore postponed, and was a boon from the hands of his brother William, the sailor king. We close the present article with an anecdote relating to this "capital controversy."

"Soon after the accession of King William, Sir George Sinclair happened to be at Fulham Palace just before paying a visit to his Majesty at Brighton. He asked the Bishop whether he could deliver any message from him to the King. The weather was extremely hot, and the Bishop jocularly replied, 'You may present my duty to his Majesty, and say that at this tropical season I find my episcopal wig a serious encumbrance, and that I hope he will not consider me guilty of a breach of Court etiquette, if I am induced to lay it aside.' Sir George repeated this message for the amusement of the King, who, however, took it up seriously, and replied, 'Tell the Bishop that he is not to wear a wig on my account; I dislike it as much as he does, and shall be glad to see the whole Bench wear their own hair.' The result was that Bishop Blomfield took the hint; other bishops followed his example, and the episcopal wig was gradually discontinued."—I. 97, 98.

(To be concluded in the next No.)

MATTHEW HENRY: A SHORT ACCOUNT OF HIS LIFE AND LABOURS;

BEING THE SUBSTANCE OF LECTURES DELIVERED ON THE RE-OPENING OF THE PRESBYTERIAN CHAPEL, CHESTER, AFTER IMPROVEMENTS INTENDED TO COMMEMORATE THE TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS BIRTH.

BY J. K. MONTGOMERY.*

RETURNING to Broad Oak immediately after his ordination, he proceeded to Chester without delay; and on Thursday, June 2, 1687, commenced his very happy and successful ministry in this congregation, which continued till within about two years of his death.

In undertaking to form a new society of which there was only a nucleus in existence, he naturally desired to obtain the consent of the older ejected minister still residing in the city, who for five-and-twenty years had preached to a congregation assembling very privately in his own house, and had "ridden out the storm" which had so frequently and violently burst over his contemporaries, Mr. Cook and Mr. Hall, both recently gone to their reward—the blessedness of the persecuted for righteousness' sake. And so considerate and conscientious was the young minister, that before he would even preach his first sermon, he waited upon Mr. Harvey (in his own words) "to know whether he had consented to my coming, as my friends had assured me, whom I told that if I found it otherwise, I would certainly return to the place from whence I came. He told me he had consented to my coming. He thought there was work enough for two ministers in Chester; and if another must come, he would rather I should than any man in the north of England" (MS.).

This was very gratifying to Mr. Henry, who ever afterwards lived on the most friendly terms with Mr. Harvey, and always shewed the same considerateness towards him, and indeed treated him with the respectful deference of a son. He had scarcely been a month in Chester when he proposed to Mr. Harvey "that both our congregations might be united, and I would be his assistant, or at least that we might joyn together in the Lord's Supper; but he peremptorily refused both, saying we would both stand upon our own bottom" (MS.).

In prospect of having a settled minister, the little flock worshipping in the entrance-hall of a private house in Whitefriars increased so much under the temporary charge of Mr. Tong, that it became necessary to provide a more commodious place of meeting. Accordingly, "a large stable" on the same premises having been "made tolerably decent and convenient for the purpose," was opened for worship some two or three Sundays

* Continued from p. 373.

before the arrival of the young pastor. In this building, the site of which cannot now be identified, Matthew Henry on that lecture evening, June 2, 1687, preached his first sermon "publicly;" and there the congregation continued to worship and to prosper during the next thirteen years of his ministry.

His first discourse sounded the key-note of his preaching throughout life: "I determined to know nothing among you but Jesus Christ and him crucified." And never did minister or apostle more constantly, more fervently or more practically preach his Master and his Master's gospel. He was "most in his element," he said, "when preaching Christ." It was the "sweet subject" which was most pleasant to him, and of which he "loved to hear." "The more I think and speak of Christ, the more reason I see to love him," was his expressed experience. But he ever preached Christ, not of envy and strife, but of goodwill; not of contention, but of love. With him, in truth, "love was the golden thread which runs through the whole gospel,—God's love to us, ours to Him, and to one another." But he also held that "they who believe in God should be careful to maintain good works," was an equally faithful saying as that "Christ came into the world to save sinners." Both were to be preached, and such preaching he regarded as "faithful preaching." The pleasant ways and peaceful paths of practical godliness were those in which he desired to lead his people, that through faith and knowledge of the gospel they "should *live* Christ as well as study Christ and preach Christ."

And to inspire that faith and guide them to right knowledge of the Scriptures, he commenced on the first Sunday of his ministry that systematic exposition of the Bible which he continued till its close. "And in twenty years (he says) I expounded over all the Old Testament consecutively (only when we were in some parts not so edifying, on sacrament days I expounded the gospel psalms), and am now (1710) going over it for the second time, and have got as far as Numbers" (MS.). On lecture evenings he expounded the Psalms, and went over them in all about five times.

His practice, even method and style in this respect, may have been greatly influenced by his father's example and his early home training. For Philip Henry always carefully expounded the Scriptures in his family, and required his children to take notes. This may have laid the foundation for that simple, devout and practical elucidation of Scripture for which Matthew Henry was so distinguished. His written Commentary naturally grew out of his pulpit practice, and no doubt embodies much of the matter of his sermons as well as of his pulpit expositions. He opened up the Scriptures in the light of his own clear understanding, earnest faith and devout spirit, seeking to make them plain to the comprehension of the humblest minds, and yet the

wisest were still instructed in the things of the spirit. This is perhaps his chief merit as a biblical expositor, that he clearly, plainly, practically brought out what he conceived to be the teachings of Scripture; and brought them home to the heart for the culture of the Christian spirit, guidance and growth in the Christian life. For this his Commentary is chiefly valuable, and still deservedly holds a high place in the esteem of large classes of Christians.

One good result of this practice of methodically expounding Scripture from the pulpit was, that his people generally gained a more intimate acquaintance with the Bible than was then otherwise attainable. Bible Societies were not then in existence to place the Scriptures in every family. *Popular* commentaries were almost unknown. Few could even read the Scriptures, and fewer still possessed them. The Bible chained to a pillar in the church, as Matthew Henry's own was in the gallery of this chapel, was almost the only means of access to the sacred writings which many enjoyed.

But even in these days of cheap and varied literature, sacred and secular, and when almost every child can read, the systematic exposition of the Bible might be still useful. And it may be even that it is scarcely less necessary as a means of imparting a deeper knowledge of the Scriptures than is possessed by many, who find so much else to read, presenting greater variety and amusement, that they have little time and perhaps little inclination to gain a thorough acquaintance with the highest book and the noblest literature in any language. And it might greatly tend also to give to the young and others some sure and reasonable grounds of faith in the Bible, in view of modern investigations, and the new light in which they are presenting to Christian minds the character and inspiration of the Bible and the grounds of its authority and of its claims upon our faith,—undermining many old theories on these subjects, if not disturbing the foundations of faith in divine revelation. On many grounds, indeed, the old Puritan practice referred to might very profitably be pursued or revived in most of the churches.

Matthew Henry's preaching also was very systematic and scriptural as to subject and illustration, though in both respects he drew largely from every source of knowledge within the range of his varied culture. But his practice well accorded with his advice to young ministers: "That the subjects of discourse should be the plainest and most needful truth; and the object to make them plainer." With this aim in view, his preaching was earnest and practical, as well as plain and simple. "I stand out here (he said on one occasion) not to trifle with you about indifferent things; but in the name of Christ, my Master, to make a serious offer to you of life and salvation upon the terms of faith and repentance."

Nor could Paul himself have had a higher sense of the greatness of his work, nor have more magnified his office as an ambassador for Christ, to whom had been given the same ministry of reconciliation. The great apostle was neither more sincere nor more profuse in his strong expressions of self-depreciation.

The great principles and practical duties of the gospel were his chief subjects of discourse. Critical questions and doctrinal controversy he usually avoided. Even doctrinal subjects were treated in no dogmatical spirit, but with a view to enforce their practical teachings in relation to the Christian character and life as regarded from his Puritan point of view. It was a saying of his that "the very life and soul of religion consists in *conscientious regard* to Jesus Christ; *that* Christianizes morality, and turns *moral virtue into evangelical holiness.*"

Let it not be supposed, however, that there is any desire to question the general orthodoxy, as the term is commonly used, of his doctrinal views. Yet whilst he had strong convictions, and held them firmly, his views were never extreme. Nor was he ever a partizan in any sense, but was very tolerant and charitable towards those who differed from him, as we shall presently see.

His method was minute and exhaustive. He would divide and subdivide his subject, and introduce every topic pertinent to his main design. He left little for his hearers to do but to "mark, learn and inwardly digest" the spiritual food so bountifully provided out of his rich treasures of human knowledge and spiritual wisdom. In expression he was often pointed and pithy, and at times quaint, perhaps to a fault, in the eye at least of the mere critic of style, but it was often with a gain of force and power.

His preaching was always marked by great earnestness; but in early life it was so fervent, even to vehemence, that both himself *and his hearers*, it is said, were often moved to tears. On one occasion after preaching, he enters in his diary: "I had some enlargement of affection, and I find some prejudice to my bodily strength by my over-earnestness; but I cannot help it, for I believe the things I speak to be true and great, and I would be in my work as one that is in earnest." His early vehemence, however, was toned down by time and experience, yet without detriment to his earnestness.

In prayer he was particularly fervent and fluent and full, and had great power in securing the attention and elevating the feelings. The gifts of the spirit for which he especially supplicated were faith, love, hope, patience, zeal, delight in God. It was the "sweet and precious duty" in whose exercise he delighted. In truth, it was the very atmosphere of his religious life, which, together with an intensity of faith, seldom ever clouded: faith in God, in Christ, in the gospel, in the everlasting life, was the source of that Christian maturity of character to which he attained and to which he sought to lead others.

Having given this general view of the character and spirit of his teachings, it may be interesting to know how the Sundays were spent and the services conducted in this place in those days. Worship commenced at nine o'clock with singing, usually the 100th Psalm. An introductory prayer followed. Then an exposition of the Scriptures—the Old in the morning, the New in the afternoon. Then a prayer half-an-hour in length. Then preaching for an hour, followed by prayer; the service concluding with hymn and benediction. This was his usual work, morning and afternoon, sabbath after sabbath, year after year, in conducting public worship.

He had a weekly lecture also, at which, with occasional subjects, he delivered distinct and sometimes long courses of sermons. One series was on "the Great Grace and Duty of Charity," from 1 Corinthians xiii.; another, "Concerning Faith and its Cloud of Witnesses," founded on Hebrews xi.—140 discourses. And for twenty years he lectured "on the questions contained in the Scriptures," taking 100 out of the Old Testament; then, after 60 from the New, turning back to the Old; winding up the course at the close of his ministry in Chester with the question (Rev. xviii. 18), "What city is like unto this great city?" Of this preaching from questions he says: "It seems a method somewhat singular, but I can truly say I do not affect singularity. My desire is to please and profit." And no doubt its peculiarity and the wide range of striking and interesting subjects for which it would afford scope, would make it both pleasing and profitable.

The instruction of the young was also a part of his work in which he took great interest, and is said to have been at once effective and attractive. His classes were attended by others besides his catechumens. The more intelligent and serious of these he would induce to join the communion, for which he prepared them by private conversation and public catechizing, addressing to them a suitable sermon before receiving them to the Lord's Supper. This was regarded as a fitting substitute for, indeed a kind of confirmation before admitting the young into full church communion. The plan was found successful; and if still followed in the churches, as recommended some years ago amongst ourselves by one whose recommendation always carries great weight with it, might be the means of leading many to the enjoyment of the communion, by whom it is now neglected, if not slighted, as though it pertained not to *them* and had no *blessing* for them.

Matthew Henry specially delighted in the communion, and greatly excelled in its administration. He often recurred to these communion occasions in this place, even after he had left Chester. He has put on record this interesting statement concerning its administration: "That since then (his first communion) I have never failed (thanks be to my good God) to admin-

ister the Lord's Supper the first Lord's-day in every month, except March, 1688-9, when I had the smallpocks, and my honoured father administered it; and in Sept., 1704, when I was ill of a fever, and Dr. Benyon (Philip Henry's successor) administered it the second Lord's-day; and by the second Lord's-day in October I was so well recovered as to administer it myself. *Laus Deo*" (MS.). The number of communicants increased from 45 at first to 350 before the end of his ministry.

To these ordinary labours was added a quarterly fast, which was observed by the congregation, besides frequent public fasts and thanksgiving days (he also kept private fasts in his closet and with his family). Sometimes these special services would be held monthly for a whole year together in times of political troubles, and he "improved" them with great carefulness of preparation, and never failed to observe them except from illness or other special cause. He was at Broad Oak on one of these fast days, on the sad occasion of his father's death, of which we have this record, shewing his piety and devotedness: "This day is a public fast. My place is vacant. It did not use to be so; but God will have it so now. I had not thought to have done anything at Broad Oak." But seeing the people greatly troubled at the removal of Philip Henry at such a time, he says: "I remember I had often heard my father say that *weeping must not hinder* sowing. I therefore thought it my duty to spend two or three hours in the meeting-place," ministering to his father's mourning flock. This was his text: "Elisha died; and the bands of the Moabites invaded the land."

He also established every winter, after 1689, weekly meetings for private conference, held at the house of a member of the congregation, which were "managed with all the seriousness, yet all the agreeable freedom we could." He always presided at these meetings, and summed up after others had spoken, commencing and closing them with prayer. "This exercise" was kept up, with "exception of two or three winters," till 1712. "For some time (he very quietly remarks) the elder members of the congregation assisted in it, but they growing weary of it, of late years I took the younger" (MS.).

In pastoral work he was diligent and faithful; almost daily visiting the sick, even beyond his own flock (often entering also in his diary some account of their bodily and spiritual state); comforting his people in times of trouble; counselling them in difficulties—but always telling them to trust more to their own prayers than to his advice; and praying with them, after the Puritan custom, on almost all occasions of interest or importance in their families, even to the starting upon a journey, putting a child to a trade, and like events. He was best pleased at all times when his friends "put him to praying with them." Indeed, he usually went away dissatisfied, even from ordinary friendly

gatherings, whatever the company or entertainment, at which there had been no opportunity for prayer. Such his Puritan piety. But he had a faithful, praying people, and that made all his duties easier and pleasanter.

But he was faithful when the duty was not so pleasant; when he had to admonish or reprove the evil-disposed, or those who brought discredit upon their Christian profession. And in what congregation may not some such persons be found? But he never failed, after due inquiry, to deal plainly with delinquents, always privately at first. If this succeeded, he greatly rejoiced. But in case of graver offences, he would suspend them from the Lord's table, and even administer public rebuke. Some would be humbled, and on repentance would be restored, as Paul enjoined. But others at times would rebel against the strictness of this discipline, become angry with their too faithful pastor, and walk no more with him; and it was remarked that these generally "fell into evil courses and lost all sense of religion." These things were a sore trial to him; and so discouraged him at times, he confesses, that they were often a great temptation to him entirely to lay aside the pastoral charge; "but I dare not; I cannot do it."

Such were some of his labours in and for his own congregation. But he was so moved by the state of religion in the neighbourhood, that in his zeal he delivered monthly lectures in several places, and in others preached more frequently. Scarcely a week passed that he had not service in some of the neighbouring towns and villages. His visits extended even as far as Shrewsbury. He also made an annual tour, always on horseback, to Stafford and the Potteries, preaching sometimes every day in the week in the course of his journey. During the latter half of his ministry, he also regularly visited Manchester, Bolton, and other towns in Lancashire, on the same mission.

After the "Cheshire classis" was re-organized in 1691, he regularly attended all its meetings, held half-yearly and generally at Knutsford, even till the very year of his death. He preached before the ministers on eight occasions, besides being several times Moderator of the Assembly. [There are several interesting notices of Matthew Henry in the minutes of the Classis, now in possession of the respected minister of Brook-Street chapel, Knutsford, which he has kindly communicated to me. But as the MS. is being prepared for publication, it is perhaps right that they should first appear in their original connection.]

In *later years*, also, he frequently took part in the ordination of young ministers in connection with the Assembly, though for many years, from humility and a conscientious feeling, he refused to do so. The first occasion on which we find him so engaged was at the ordination of Mr. (afterwards Dr.) Benyon, his father's successor, when we find this entry, Jan. 1699: "I have always

declined joining in such work, judging it fittest to be done by aged ministers; but this I could not decline." He also took a large share in a course of lectures "against Profaneness and Immorality," delivered in several of the principal towns by the Cheshire ministers in 1698; besides being frequently called upon to preach occasional sermons, especially funeral discourses on the death of ministers and others in the district.

Another work in which he took much interest and did good service was preaching to the prisoners in the castle. His biographers were unable, it seems, to fix the date at which these services commenced; and they have given a version of the circumstances in which they originated somewhat different, though perhaps reconcilable with that given by himself. This is his account (MS. record): "In 1695, I was invited by several prisoners in the castle that had layn long there *for debt* and had no preaching, to come sometimes on a week-day and preach to them, which I did about once in three weeks, and sometimes oftener; and we besides (?) had a collection for them; but upon some change in the government of the castle, we were obliged to lay it down." This seems to have been about 1710; and the change referred to is supposed to have been the appointment of a new chaplain, who was jealous of the intrusion of a Dissenter, and caused some unpleasantness to the governor, on which Mr. Henry, in his love of peace, withdrew. No doubt he also preached to some of the criminals as well as to the debtors, and so did all the good ascribed to him. I am sure he did all he had the opportunity of doing.

Yet, amid all this public work, he found or made time to attend Mr. Harvey's weekly lectures and those of Dr. Hancock, of St. Michael's church, from which his predecessor, Mr. Cook, had been ejected; and also any special services at other churches, such as the monthly Reformation lectures (in 1698), delivered at St. Peter's, by the Bishop (Dr. Statford), Dr. Fog, the Dean, and other clergymen. He thus shewed his sympathy with a movement in which he greatly rejoiced. But he prudently abstained at first from doing anything himself in the same direction, lest he should do harm to a cause which he had much at heart, by arousing the jealousy of the Church promoters of the movement. He frequently mentions these lectures in his diary, and thus notices one of the Dean's discourses: "I bless God for it. And as I have from my heart forgiven, so will I endeavour to forget all the Dean has at any time said against Dissenters, and against me in particular." He was too magnanimous to be envious, too Christian to be unforgiving.

There being great opposition to the movement in the city, the promoters formed a "Society for the Reformation of Manners," then indeed much needed, both amongst the clergy and the laity. And the Dean indirectly made overtures to Mr. Henry "that

the Dissenters should form themselves into a society and act in concert with the other." This led to an interview with Dr. Fog, who received him very kindly, he says, shewed him all their plans, and encouraged him to go on. He consented to do so, but was not sanguine that any very good results would follow.

Some High-church preacher at one of these St. Peter's lectures reflected severely upon the Dissenters as unfit to engage in the work because of their schism. Another followed in the same spirit, but with still worse invective, suggesting that Dissenters by their Nonconformity only hardened the profane, and needed reformation themselves. The Dean was much annoyed, and apologized to Mr. Henry, who in his usual Christian spirit thus notices the matter in his diary: "The Lord judge between us; perhaps it will be found that the Dissenters have been the strongest bulwark against profaneness in England." But the movement did not continue long. The wickedness of the place was too strong even for the good Bishop, the Dean and Dissenters, all united. Mr. Henry, however, towards the close of the year, delivered a course of reformation sermons on his own lecture evenings.

Looking at the character and variety of these labours of Matthew Henry, we cannot but be impressed by the amount of work which his zeal laid upon him. Nor can we fail to discern in this, and the motives and principles which inspired and sustained him amidst such labours, the secret of his fame and of his success, both great. Yet must we also feel, I think, with his biographer, "that nobody looks upon his great industry as a common measure to which all others are obliged to come up. Those who have not his strength of body, freedom and readiness of thought, natural fervour and easiness of expression, can no more come up to his standard, as to the multitude, variety and excellence of his ministerial services, than a child can bear a strong man's burden." Or, as the same thought was expressed by himself, "If God has given me more than others, He expects more of me."

Though a Nonconformist from thoughtful examination and conscientious conviction, yet he had no desire to break with the Church. Like most of the Baxterian school to which he belonged, he still hoped that the Church might in time repent, and open her arms wide enough to comprehend all Christians of moderate views, without enforcing subscription to articles which they did not believe, and assent to ceremonies which they hated. Still they shewed a delicacy and deference towards the Establishment—Mr. Henry amongst the number—which sometimes had the appearance even of timidity, wishing to avoid giving any offence or ground for a charge of schism (an ecclesiastical ghost then set up to frighten timid separatists). They not only met for worship out of church hours, but many continued to

attend church in the afternoon. Mr. Henry at first held his afternoon service at four o'clock, "when the Church service was over, thinking (as he mentions) that thereby the Church would be somewhat obliged, which we were very ambitious of doing; and the more because our liberty was somewhat precarious, and the Papists were designing (1687-8) the ruin of us all. But Mr. Greg pleading it with Dr. Fog, in mitigation of the separation, that we came to church one part of the day, the Dr. told him that made the matter no better. It was schismatical at any time. Whereupon (he says) we altered our method, and our meeting was held at church time, both morning and afternoon; and so we continued, through the good hand of our God upon us, ever since" (MS., 1712).

This was the Nonconformist's reply to the Dean's charge of being schismatical. Mr. Harvey, emboldened by Matthew Henry's example, also changed his course, and held his services at church hours.

These and other incidents of similar kind greatly strengthened Mr. Henry's Nonconformity. In 1703, he records: "I have great satisfaction this year in my Nonconformity." In 1704, when laid aside by fever, he was greatly disturbed that on a day of public thanksgiving an eminent dignitary of the Church should speak so harshly of Dissenters, as to charge them with inexcusable frowardness. Whereupon we find this entry in his diary: "Is there *no peace, then*, unless we will submit in everything to those who say to our souls, Bow down that we may pass over?" So on another occasion he declares: "I am confirmed in my Nonconformity from the consideration of the imposing of the sacramental test." And in 1709, in reference to an intolerant discourse by Dr. Sacheverell, he records: "It gave me occasion to bless God that I am a Dissenter."

Yet his charity and candour were as great as his firmness in everything in which principle was involved. He ever acted upon his own advice to others, "to delight in the holy generosity of speaking well of those who differ from you." And he found great comfort in the reflection that he had never suffered a man's differing from him to lead him "to detract from his moral or intellectual excellence;" whilst his liberality and charity found marked expression on an occasion hereafter to be mentioned. The harshest thing, I think, he ever said, even in respect of the widest theological differences, was that "pride is the cause of heresy,"—about as true as that the same vice or "perversity" of mind was the cause of Nonconformity, as alleged against his friend Richard Baxter. The epithet, "that arch-heretic," applied to Socinus, was perhaps harsher. But this was the religious spirit and language of the times. And we know how often good men will use bitter words and do harsh things, even whilst in their heart there are no really harsh or bitter feelings. Matthew

Henry, I am sure, had none. And even in our own day are not the same things uttered by many who should ere this have better learned the lesson of Christian charity, but who are still far short of the breadth and liberality of Matthew Henry, a century and a half ago?

An incident which occurred soon after his settlement in Chester brought some reproach upon him as a Nonconformist; but very unjustly, for it seems rather creditable to his moderation and conscientiousness. He gives this account of it.

King James, in his progress into Wales, visited Chester, Sept., 1687. The clergy and Churchmen, and the civil authorities of the city, were forward in presenting addresses to his Majesty; and some ministers had come from Lancashire for the same purpose. Mr. Henry being told that it would be expected of them also, he and Mr. Harvey and "the heads of our congregations joyn'd in an address to him, thanking him not for assuming the dispensing power, but for our ease and quiet and liberty under his protection. We presented it to him at the palace; he told us he wish'd we had a magna charta for our liberty. We did not promise to assist in taking away the tests, but only to live quiet and peaceable lives. And since, we have been reproach'd for making this innocent and inoffensive address to the King to return him thanks for our liberty;" he retorts, putting the *tu quoque* upon his accusers: "We cannot but remember that Sir Richard Lieving, the recorder, made a speech to King James on his entering into the city, wherein he told him that the corporation was his Majesty's creature, and depended upon the will of its *creator*; and that the sole intimation of his Majesty's pleasure should have with them the force of *fundamental law*" (MS.).

Compared with this, the address of the Nonconformists was manly and independent. But it was even ingenuous and conscientious in comparison also with some of the strong and fulsome addresses of other Nonconformists at the same period. And if other justification were needed to silence his accusers, it is supplied by the statement of an historian of high authority: "If Nonconformists expressed gratitude to the King by flattering addresses, so Bishops (and his Lordship of Chester amongst them) prevailed with their clergy to send addresses to him, *as for a signal favour to the Church of England.*"*

The fact and character of the address, whilst creditable to Mr. Henry's truthfulness and moderation, shew indeed his readiness to avail himself of any liberty which even the King's indulgence might afford till it could be legally obtained. Accordingly, two years later, when the Toleration Act passed, securing the liberty of Dissenters, both he and Mr. Harvey qualified as the Act prescribed in order to avail themselves of its benefits, and cer-

* Rapin, II. 759.

tified the places of their meeting and other houses also in the city and the country, that they might be used for various religious purposes.

But Mr. Henry has placed on record his views on the subject of King James's indulgence, shewing that he was neither blind as to its design nor indifferent to its benefits. He says it was "intended, no doubt, in favour of his (the King's) design to introduce Popery; but wonderfully overruled by the Divine Providence, not only to the relief and comfort of many good people then in prison and otherwise in distress, but to the advancement of the interests of religion in the nation; and was likewise such a provocative to many in the Church of England, that it was the first thing, and an inlet to other things, that made them uneasy at King James and his government, and prepar'd the way for the glorious Revolution" (MS.).

Another incident, occurring a little later, shews the social and political state of things in the city at that period, and also presents Mr. Henry's character and spirit in so favourable a light, that we venture to give it in his own words, notwithstanding the length of the extract: "The charter of the city had been surrendered about 1684, and a new charter granted, by which a power was reserved to the Crown to put out magistrates and to put in at pleasure. This precarious charter was joyfully accepted by those that were for surrendering the old one, that Alderman M—— (a liberal Churchman who often attended Matthew Henry's services), and some other aldermen of the same honest principles, might be turn'd out, and none but those of their kidney taken in. * * About August, 1688, one Mr. Trinder came to Chester for the new modelling of the corporation, according to the power reserved to the Crown by the new charter. He apply'd himself to me, told me the King thought the *government of the city needed reformation*, and if I would say who should be put out and who put in their places, it should be done. I told him, I begg'd his pardon; that was none of my business, nor would I in the least intermeddle in a thing of that nature. However, he got instructions from others; the new charter was cancell'd, and another sent of the same import, only altering the persons; and by it all the Dissenters of note in the city were brought into the government, the seniors to be aldermen and the juniors to be common-councilmen. * * This charter was brought down, and the persons called together to have notice of it, and to have the time fix'd for their being sworn. But they, like true Englishmen, unanimously refus'd it, and desir'd that the ancient charter might be restor'd, though they knew that none of them would come into power by that, but that many that were their bitter enemies would be restor'd by it. This I take to be a memorable instance both of the modesty of the Dissenters, and a proof how far they are from an affectation of power; the top of their ambition being

to live quiet and peaceable lives in the free exercise of their religion according to their consciences, as also of their inviolable fidelity to the rights and liberties of their country" (MS. record).

The principles and spirit shewn by Mr. Henry in this transaction—so creditable to him as an Englishman, a Dissenter and a minister of the gospel—were those by which he was animated throughout life in all his public and social relations.

Religion with Matthew Henry was no mere profession, but the highest and most serious concern of life, the inspirer of an inward spirit of faith, goodness, duty,—bringing into subjection every thought, moulding every affection and every principle, and governing every act and word and work. It was the great end of life, and it entered into all his relations, after his own estimate of its nature and most fitting outward expression. He ever felt God's living presence and agency in all the concerns of life; and carried all things, even the most ordinary affairs, personal and family, or pertaining to his friends, to the "throne of grace" in his communion with God; and he sought to interpret the Divine will and dealings in the light of his own strong faith and Puritan views and feelings.

(To be continued.)

NOTES ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

NUMBERS xxi. 11: "And they journeyed from Oboth, and they pitched at Ije of the Hebrews."

The Authorized Version has Ije-abarim, and thus gives a new rendering to the word which is elsewhere translated Hebrews. This town might be described as "Ije beyond the Jordan;" and thus we see that while the nation of the Israelites received their name of Hebrews because they entered Canaan from where they had been residing on the "further side of the Jordan," that name also belonged in a narrower sense to a small tribe who dwelt in the land of Moab. The same correction may be made in Numbers xxvii. 12, and in other places.

Numbers xviii. 16: "Those that are to be redeemed from a month old shalt thou make them to redeem, according to thy own valuation."

There is often so much want of exactness in the Hebrew language, that we can hardly call the Authorized Version mistaken when we read there, "shalt thou redeem." But as the command is addressed to Aaron, the meaning is abundantly clear: he is told to require the worshipers to redeem at a money price those animals which they may have vowed, and which are not fit for the altar. The same correction should be made in the verse before and the verse after.

Leviticus xxiv. 11: "And the Israelitish woman's son pronounced the Name, and cursed."

The Authorized Version rather weakens this passage by explaining that it is the Name of Jehovah.

Leviticus xx. 26: "A man also or woman that hath a bottle-spirit, or that is a wizard, shall surely be put to death."

This custom of the ventriloquists making use of bottles, and leading their cheated followers to believe that the bottle, or a spirit within it, spoke to them, is often mentioned in the Old Testament. The Authorized Version calls these bottles "familiar spirits." The woman that Saul consulted at Endor had a bottle, and made him believe that the bottle spoke to him.

Numbers xxviii. 26: "On the day of the firstlings, when ye bring a new meal-offering unto Jehovah, in your feast of weeks," &c.

The Hebrew word for firstlings of the flocks may also be translated as first-fruits of the harvest, and the Authorized Version so translates it in this place. But the first-fruits were brought to the temple in the Passover week, while the firstlings were brought seven weeks later, at the Pentecost, or feast of weeks.

Deuteronomy ii. 8: "And when we passed by from our brethren the children of Esau, which dwelt in Seir, from the Way of the Plain [or Arabah], from Elath, and from Ezion-gaber, we turned and passed by the way of the desert of Moab."

The valley between the Red Sea and the Dead Sea is even now called Wady Arabah, or *the Plain*. It was by this path that the Israelites wished to pass, as more clearly described in Exodus xxi.; but they were stopped by the Edomites; and here we see that they turned from Arabah, *the Plain*, to the desert of Moab. The Authorized Version has it, "through the way of the plain," thus destroying the testimony which our modern travels bear to the geographical accuracy of the writer.

Numbers xxxiii. 12: "And they removed from the desert of Sin, and encamped in Dophkah, or place of *bruising*."

The Israelites were now in the neighbourhood of the Egyptian copper-mines, which have been described by several of our travellers. This is a country without timber or fuel of any kind, and hence we may be very sure that the copper-ore was not smelted on the spot, but carried away to Egypt for that purpose. The only work which would there be carried on would be bruising or pounding the pieces of rock, so that the ore might be sent away encumbered as little as possible with the stone in which it was embedded. Hence, probably, one of these stations in the desert might be called "the Bruising Place."

Numbers xxxiii. 16: "And they encamped at the burial-place of Hattavah."

This spot, the burial-place of the Egyptian miners above spoken of, is even now marked by the tombstones and funereal tablets sculptured with hieroglyphics. These miners were the armed men who under Amalek, their leader, fought against the Israelites at Rephidim, and who in some of the later books of the Bible are supposed to be Amalekites.

Numbers xxxiii. 17. The following six stations tell us by their names that they are all within the fertile valley now called Wady Feiran. They may be translated, the Villages or Huts, the Broom-bushes, the Pomegranate Gap, the White Poplars, the Dew and the Meetings.

Leviticus xxiii. 10: "Ye shall bring a sheaf, the first of your harvest, unto the priest."

The Authorized Version has, "of the first-fruits of your harvest." The difference is not great, but it is necessary to be attended to if we would understand the Jewish calendar. The first-fruits were offered, as we shall see in verse 17, fifty days later, or at Pentecost, called the feast of weeks. This first sheaf seems by custom to have been brought to the temple during the Passover-week, though no passage in the Bible fixes the time when it was to be so brought. All that we are told is, that the first-fruits were offered during the feast of weeks, fifty days after the sheaf, the first of the harvest. Hence the necessity for keeping the two distinct.

S. S.

JOHN CALVIN.

It is not sufficient to shew the ability of Calvin as an administrator, or his power as a preacher, or his general practical excellence as a commentator on the Scriptures, and then to excuse his severity as a persecutor by saying that he inherited that ill disposition from the Roman school in which he had been brought up; such might be a fair excuse for others, his contemporaries, among the Reformers; but his stern persecuting spirit was in special keeping with his own theology. He had substituted for the exclusive creed of Rome another no less exclusive, no less hardening. He was in possession of a knowledge of the will of God, and all beyond his own pale were heirs of damnation, destined to the fire of hell; the flowers of earth were little worth considering; Calvin's Gospel was a car of Juggernaut, and he himself one of its wheels. Why should he not crush a son of perdition like Servetus?—*Westminster Review*.

BIBLIOLATRY.

THE publication of the Reviews and Essays and of Bishop Colenso's work on the Pentateuch has stirred up a controversy in the Church of England which will probably be of long duration; and, it is to be feared, will excite no small portion of the virulence and uncharitableness which, with very few exceptions, accompany and disgrace religious controversy, and which will be a sad deduction from the good which we cannot doubt will result from it. A controversy of this kind arising in the Established Church is calculated to interest and affect not only its members, but those of every other religious sect and party in the country. Even in this enlightened age and nation, the Bible is much talked of and much *read*, but very little *studied*; and even of those who really study its contents, the far larger portion do so not in the way of an impartial searching after truth, but to support and strengthen themselves in their adherence to the church or sect in which they have been brought up; and to depart from the doctrines which it professes they would hold to be a grievous offence against the Almighty. It has been well said that the Church of Rome holds itself to be infallible, and the Church of England admits its fallibility, but nevertheless virtually asserts that it never errs. How else could it possibly justify the damnatory clauses of the falsely-called Athanasian Creed? The Church of England, however, is in much the same condition as most other Protestant churches and sects, few of which shrink from condemning to perdition those who deny some of their favourite doctrines. Few, indeed, it is to be feared, read the Bible with a view to ascertain what it is that it teaches, without regarding the doctrines of any church or sect, or the opinions of any individual, however learned, wise or good. It is in the firm belief that the existing controversy will increase the number of the searchers after religious truth, and that juster views of religion will be the consequence, that we cannot but rejoice that the works which have occasioned it have been published, although we see much in them to which we are strongly opposed. Much of Bishop Colenso's work must, we think, command the assent of every rational mind, but many parts of it appear very questionable; and the scope of the whole argument keeps the reader's attention mainly directed to the question whether Moses was the author of the Pentateuch, and not to the far larger and more important question whether the whole Bible is the word of God. That that doctrine should be held at this time of day by any one who lays claim to the exercise of independent thought, after the subject has been so often fully discussed and the most conclusive arguments have been again and again produced to disprove it, would seem strange, if we could forget how strong a hold opinions that have been long established have on the mind, and how

greatly their adherence is strengthened when they are generally held by those in authority, who are thought to have a better understanding than others of the subject, who claim to be the lawful instructors of the people, and who are usually, and to a great extent justly, looked up to as possessing superior education, knowledge and ability than their fellow-countrymen possess. As the plenary inspiration of the Bible is the doctrine of the Church of England, we are therefore the less surprised that it has been said by several of those who have answered Bishop Colenso, that every chapter, every verse and every letter of the Bible is the word of God.

We beg to say here that we fully believe that Abraham was called by God, and that his descendants through Isaac and Jacob were separated and set apart from the nations of the earth by Divine Providence for the purpose of preserving the knowledge of the unity of God, and that a revelation of his holy will and commandments was communicated to them by Moses. Many satisfactory arguments have been adduced at various times and in many different ways, which, we think, fully establish the divine authority of the religion of the Israelites. No one who is acquainted with the writings of the wisest of the philosophers of Greece and Rome, and who has read the Old Testament with attention, can have failed to perceive the great superiority of the latter in all that relates to religion and to the character of the Deity. None of the ancient philosophers attained a clear and distinct conception of the unity of God; and the gods in whom the heathens professed to believe are described as subject to the vilest passions of human nature, and committing acts from which our moral nature revolts, and on which it passes its severest censure. In the Old Testament the great truth that there is but one God is constantly asserted; and in many parts of it, particularly in Job, the Psalms and the Prophets, are to be found the most exalted conceptions of the Deity, and the noblest sentiments of piety and virtue. When we consider that the Psalms, the greater part of which are on satisfactory grounds believed to have been written by David, who lived about three thousand years ago, are generally acknowledged to be the finest manual of devotion in existence, and that they form an important part of religious worship throughout the Christian world, an impartial mind cannot but exclaim, "Truly the hand of God is here." A higher proof still of the divine authority of the religion of Moses is to be found in the history of our Saviour Jesus Christ contained in the Gospels. Condemning as he does the traditions by which the religion of Moses had been disfigured and debased before and in the age in which he lived, and inveighing in terms of severity, which he used on no other occasion, against the conduct of the Scribes and Pharisees, who then enjoyed the highest reputation for religion, and for knowledge of the law, he explicitly

acknowledges the authority of the law which they had thus corrupted.

It must, however, be admitted that many parts of the Old Testament, and some of the New, *appear* to be inconsistent with the character which is usually ascribed to the Deity, and with the sentiments of compassion, benevolence and mercy which are frequently and strongly inculcated in the sacred volume. With these we have to do; we cannot evade them; and the following pages contain an attempt to discover in what light they ought to be considered by Christians, and whether there be anything in the Bible of divine authority which is really inconsistent with the pure and holy religion which was taught by Jesus Christ and his apostles, and which is now the professed religion of the most highly instructed and civilized nations of the earth.

There are difficulties attending the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Bible which, as far as we are aware, have never been brought forward so prominently as they should have been. When we are told that there is a book called the Bible, every word of which is the word of God, the first question which we naturally ask is, Where is this book to be found? Is it the Bible in the languages in which it was written? If so, among the existing MSS., which are known to differ, where is the infallible one to be found? What security have we that other MSS., differing from those now known, may not be discovered hereafter, having a stronger claim to be the authentic Bible than any we now possess? O, it may be said, Divine Providence has no doubt preserved the true Bible. Has, then, Divine Providence given us the means of discovering which of the existing MSS. it is? But if the infallible MS. can be found, it will obviously be of immediate use to the comparatively small number of Christians who understand Hebrew and Greek, and the rest of the Christian world must be content with translations. In truth, we believe that the assertors of the doctrine of plenary inspiration do not trouble themselves at all about this matter; and that what they really mean is that the received version now in use in the Church of England is the Bible, every chapter, verse and word of which was inspired by God. We know that the translators of the received version used several different MSS. Have we, then, any proof that they were directed by the Spirit of God to select the right reading in every particular case in which the MSS. differed? But supposing them to have used only one, they must have been directed by the Spirit to select that one. On what ground are we to assume that the honest and pious men who had translated the Scriptures before the translators of the received version, had been allowed to fall into error, and that the last translators alone had been gifted with infallibility? But supposing it possible that these difficulties are surmounted, where is the security that the copies which we now possess are free from

error? That they should be so requires a succession of infallible compositors and printers. We cannot say of our own knowledge that differences are to be found in different copies of our Bible, but we have often heard it asserted and never denied; and if the assertion be true, where are we to look for the infallible copy?

It is well known that since the publication of the received edition of the Bible many MSS. have been brought to light, esteemed by all learned men who have studied the subject to be of far higher antiquity, and therefore of much greater authority, than any used by the translators of the received version, and that many translations of the Scriptures have been published in which the superior importance of the older MSS. has been acknowledged, and many supposed errors of the former editions have been corrected.

Sir Isaac Newton published a little tract which he called *Two Notable Corruptions of Scripture*. One of these, that of the three witnesses (1 John v. 7), has been shewn by the soundest critical arguments to be a forgery; and we are not aware that a single well-informed individual can now be found to assert its authenticity. The last person who defended it was, we believe, the late Bishop Burgess. Soon after the publication of Newton's tract, Dr. Bentley, the first Greek scholar of his day, was asked whether Sir Isaac had convinced him, and he answered, "No; for I was convinced already." The other text (1 Tim. iii. 16), in which Newton says the word *God* has been improperly inserted, is not so generally admitted to be a corruption; but the arguments which have been adduced to prove it to be so are so clear and convincing, as to make it probable that, but that it has been deemed to support the doctrine of the Trinity, it would long ago have shared the fate of the text of the three witnesses.

No rational and reflecting person, in reading the Scriptures, can fail to observe how unskilfully, and in some parts absurdly, the divisions into chapters and verses have been made; by which, Locke justly observes, "not only the common people take the verses usually as distinct aphorisms, but even men of more advanced knowledge, in reading them, lose much of the strength and force of the coherence, and the light that depends on it."* Surely, if the translators of the received text of the Bible had that infallible guidance which is claimed for them, they would not have sent their work into the world encumbered with this fruitful source of error. To us it seems plain, that the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Bible, if admitted to be true, can be applied to no particular copy now in existence, and is therefore entirely useless. We shall now endeavour to shew that this doctrine has led to great errors in the Christian church;

* Locke's admirable Preface to his Paraphrase of the Epistles of St. Paul,—a work deserving the most close attention of serious inquirers.

that it is calculated to give great perplexity and great alarm to timid and conscientious Christians; to prevent persons from employing the time which they give to reading the Bible to the best advantage; and to lead some to infidelity.

We have placed the word Bibliolatry at the head of this article. It is a term lately introduced, we know not by whom; but it seems well to express that over-anxiety about a strict adherence to the letter, which frequently results in a misconception of the real meaning of a book. The maxim in law, *Qui hæret in litera, hæret in cortice*, may be well applied to the Scriptures. The pernicious errors which have prevailed extensively in different ages and in different churches and sects, and which, resolving all religion into faith, submission to ecclesiastical authority, and to the observance of rites and ceremonies, to the almost, and in some instances to the total, disregard of the moral duties enjoined by the divine law, have had their origin in a perverted interpretation of particular passages of the Bible, detached from the context and accepted as independent dogmas, although every reflecting reader will readily perceive that they are in direct opposition to the general scope and meaning of the sacred volume.

It may be desirable here to consider on what ground we accept the truths of religion. To those who tell us that they receive it by the special operation of the Holy Ghost, we have nothing to say. To those who believe that the Almighty has given to his human creatures faculties by which they are able to judge of the claims of a religion to be of divine authority, we will address a few words. Their assent to the truth of the Christian religion must be founded on its conformity to our reason and our moral sentiments. Imperfect as they are and liable to err, they are the only natural faculties given to us by which to admit or reject the claims of a religion to divine authority. We say natural faculties, because we are far from denying that God may and does assist and direct us by spiritual influence on our minds. When we pray to the Almighty, we hope and believe that our prayers will in some way or other be accepted, and will bring us benefits which, without our prayers, would not have been bestowed. Few thinking people, however, will deny that, in ordinary cases, we cannot distinguish spiritual influence from the exertion of our own faculties. Reason and the moral sentiment are, as much as revelation, the gifts of God. In giving the latter, he did not intend to destroy the former; and the great proofs of the divine authority of Christianity are, that it approves itself to our reason and to our moral sentiments. A religion which taught us to live in the boundless indulgence of our passions, and to hate and injure our fellow-creatures, would be unhesitatingly rejected by all serious and virtuous persons. Religion teaches us truths of infinite value, which our natural facul-

ties could never reach; and she strengthens, purifies and exalts our moral sentiments; but she nowhere contradicts our reason or our notions of right and wrong. Reason, moral sentiment and revelation are all alike from God, and the great business of our lives is to think, speak and act in harmony with them all. The strange doctrine, orthodox although it be called, that the Creator placed the future condition of the whole human race in the hands of their progenitor Adam, and that by his disobedience human nature became so completely corrupted that every human being was altogether evil, and that from this miserable condition no one could be rescued but by the immediate grace of God, is so contradictory to any conception we can form of the great and good Being who made and governs all, as to present an insuperable objection to every rational and moral mind to the reception of a religion as from God of which it forms a part. How, it will be said, could the Great First Cause give such a power to Adam, which, unless we deny his foreknowledge of future events, we must admit that he foresaw would lead to such unspeakably horrible results? How can we love, says our moral nature, a Being who has so acted? Such a creed tends directly to prevent our loving God, and to make religion, what in a vast majority of cases it seems to be, merely the result of fear. Such we do not and we cannot believe to be the religion of Jesus Christ.

One unhappy effect of the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Bible is, that it leads us to attribute to those who enjoyed particular privileges—the patriarchs, judges and prophets—a higher moral character than the rest of the human race can attain, and to judge their actions by a criterion widely different from that which we apply to other individuals. This, it may be said, is nowhere asserted in the Bible, and the fact must be admitted; but that such is the effect of the doctrine we fully believe; and references to the commentators on the Scriptures will shew to what lamentable shifts they are reduced to evade the application of our moral judgments to the leading characters of the Old Testament. Abraham, the father of the faithful, and who is even called the friend of God, is justly held entitled to our highest esteem and respect; nevertheless, there is one act recorded of him which, if we apply to it the same principles which ordinarily direct our moral judgments, we cannot help condemning surely,—we mean, his sending Hagar into the wilderness with her son Ishmael, with only bread and a bottle of water for their subsistence (Gen. xxi. 14—21). Surely, unless we are to renounce all our notions of right and wrong, we must condemn this as an inhuman transaction. Now let us see what the commentators, orthodox and heterodox, have to say about it. Bishop Patrick interprets the words, “bread and a bottle of water,” thus—“which includes all sort of provision for their present necessity, till they came to the place to which, in all probability, he

directed them to bend their course." This is not merely *making*, but actually *contradicting*, Scripture; for vers. 15, 16, run thus: "And the water was spent in the bottle, and she cast the child under one of the shrubs. And she went and sat her down over against him a good way off, as it were a bow-shot; for she said, Let me not see the death of the child." Priestley does not, like Patrick, contradict the Bible; but he says, "Perhaps Hagar, thinking herself and her son to have been ill-used, might have refused any particular favour;" that is, that she may have preferred being sent into the wilderness, exposed to the probable starvation of herself and her son, to being provided with those necessities of life to which she was justly entitled. Considering the admirable character of Abraham displayed in his history, so inconsistent with his conduct in this instance, we cannot help entertaining serious doubts of the authenticity of that part of the narrative which describes him to have sent away Hagar and Ishmael unprovided with adequate provision and protection in their journey through the wilderness. We cannot, however, adopt the opinion which an excellent writer, Canon Stanley, seems to entertain, that the character of Abraham is above our imitation and that of Jacob within it. The Bible claims perfection for one person only, Jesus Christ, and he is set forth as the object of our imitation. The name of Jacob is so frequently coupled with Abraham and Isaac, and he is so distinguished by his name of Israel having been given to his descendants, the chosen people of God, as to have led men, we think, to place his character in a far more favourable light than it deserves. In the 27th chapter of Genesis, Isaac desires his son Esau to take his quiver and bow, and to go out to the field and take venison, and to make him savoury meat. Rebekah, his wife, hearing this, directs her favourite son Jacob to take two kids of goats, with which she will make savoury meat for Isaac. This is done, and Rebekah puts Esau's garments on Jacob, and puts the skins of the goats on his hands and neck, because Esau was a hairy man and Jacob a smooth one. Jacob thus disguised goes to his father and tells him he is Esau, and when his father asks him, "How is it that thou hast found it so quickly, my son?" Jacob answers, "Because the Lord thy God brought it to me," thus adding impiety to falsehood. Having the two commentators whom I have lately quoted lying before me, let us now see how they treat this transaction. The Bishop says, "There are here many untruths told by Jacob which cannot be wholly excused; but, it must be confessed, he and his mother were possessed with a false opinion that they might deceive Isaac for the good of his family." How gentle the reproach, "cannot be excused"! Why seek to excuse it at all, but that we are to let our sense of right and wrong be partially put to sleep when applied to Scripture characters? The blame is here applied only to the falsehoods committed by Jacob,

and not a word is said in reprobation of his impiety. Priestley contents himself with saying that "the conduct of Rebekah, whose favourite Jacob was, was natural;" but he has not a word of blame for Jacob. When we call to mind that Jacob had already extorted from Esau his birthright, by refusing to allow him to satisfy his hunger by partaking of Jacob's mess of pottage when Esau considered himself to be at the point of death,—Jacob's apparently fraudulent conduct to Laban in the arrangement of his wages with Laban,—the mean and abject spirit which he displayed in his subsequent interview with Esau,—and his partiality to Joseph, so displayed as to excite the bitter hatred of his brothers against him,—we cannot doubt that far better men than Jacob have lived in every age of the world. Let it not be assumed that because he was greatly favoured by the Almighty, he was a person of very superior excellence of character. God selects his own instruments for carrying on his designs; but the selection proves nothing as to their characters. We shall have more to say on this subject presently.

We now beg to call the attention of the reader to the book of Judges, because it contains perhaps more passages calculated to perplex and confound a conscientious reader than any other book in the Bible. Let us suppose two persons—one of them a sincere, pious Christian who believes the truth of every part of the Bible, and adopts the common opinion that all is inspired by God, but who has never turned his thoughts to the ascertainment of the grounds on which that opinion rests,—the other, an unbeliever who also understands the plenary inspiration of the Bible to be the doctrine of the Christian church,—let us consider what would be the probable effect of reading the narratives to which we are about to refer on the minds of these two persons. The first story to which we shall refer is that of Ehud, contained in chap. iii. 15—30. The Lord is here said to have raised up a deliverer to the children of Israel, named Ehud, "and by him the children of Israel sent a present to Eglon, king of Moab," to whom at that time they were in subjection. Ehud goes with this present, having previously made a two-edged dagger. The present was given to the king; and the messengers having gone away, Ehud turned again, and said, "I have a secret errand for thee, O king; who said, Keep silence. And all that stood by him went out from him. And Ehud came unto him; and he was sitting in a summer parlour, which he had for himself alone. And Ehud said, I have a message from God unto thee. And he arose out of his seat. And Ehud put forth his left hand, and took the dagger from his right thigh, and thrust it into his belly: and the haft also went in after the blade; and the fat closed upon the blade, so that he could not draw the dagger out of his belly; and the dirt came out. Then Ehud went forth through the porch, and shut the doors of the parlour upon him, and locked them."

The king was found dead by his servant. Ehud then returns, and announces to the Israelites that the Lord had delivered the Moabites into their hands. A battle follows, in which ten thousand Moabites are slain, not one of them having escaped. As we find in other parts of the Bible the evil deeds of those who have been raised up by God to exalted stations are commented on with due severity, it seems reasonable to think that passages which relate the deeds of such persons without any expression of blame must be understood to represent them in a favourable light; and we shall find reason to think that such is the case when we attend to what commentators on the Bible say about them. We have neither space nor inclination to range through a number of commentators, and we select Bishop Patrick because his Commentary forms one of a series which is published together, and which is held in the highest esteem by the clergy of the Church of England. Patrick then says, "Nothing can justify this fact but an order from the Lord, which he not only pretended but really had." Not a single word is there in the account of this transaction to shew that Ehud pretended to have an order from God to assassinate Eglon; all that he professes is (ver. 20) that he had a message from God to the king, and we have no proof of the truth of that assertion but his own words.

In the fourth chapter of the book of Judges we are told that the king of Canaan "twenty years mightily oppressed the children of Israel," and Deborah, a prophetess, who judged Israel at that time, instructed Barak to take ten thousand men of the tribes of Naphtali and Zebulun to go and fight the Canaanites; and that she went with him. A battle ensued; and the whole of the army of the Canaanites was destroyed, with the single exception of Sisera, their general. The narrative proceeds as follows: "Howbeit Sisera fled away on his feet to the tent of Jael the wife of Heber the Kenite; for there was peace between Jabin* the king of Hazor and the house of Heber the Kenite. And Jael went to meet Sisera, and said unto him, Turn in, my lord, turn in to me; fear not. And when he had turned in unto her into the tent, she covered him with a mantle. And he said unto her, Give me, I pray thee, a little water to drink; for I am thirsty. And she opened a bottle of milk, and gave him drink, and covered him. Again he said unto her, Stand in the door of the tent, and it shall be, when any man doth come and inquire of thee, and say, Is there any man here? that thou shalt say, No. Then Jael, Heber's wife, took a nail of the tent, and took an hammer in her hand, and went softly unto him, and smote the nail into his temple, and fastened it into the ground: for he was fast asleep and weary. So he died." If this narrative had formed part of the history of any other nation, no one would consider

* Jabin was the king whose army Sisera had commanded.

Jael in any other light than as one who had been guilty of assassination, preceded by the worst treachery. Let us see how it is viewed by Deborah, whom we have seen described as a prophetess and a judge in Israel. In the fifth chapter is contained an ode of Deborah of singular poetical beauty, but all our concern with which is to shew her opinion of this act of Jael. "Blessed," she says, "above women shall Jael the wife of Heber the Kenite be, blessed shall she be above women in the tent. He asked water, and she gave him milk; she brought forth butter in a lordly dish. She put her hand to the nail, and her right hand to the workmen's hammer; and with the hammer she smote Sisera, she smote off his head, when she had pierced and stricken through his temples. At her feet he bowed, he fell, he lay down; at her feet he bowed, he fell; where he bowed, there he fell down dead." And now what is the comment of the orthodox Bishop Patrick on this act of Jael? "She might as well," he says, "have let him lay in his profound sleep till Barak came and took him; if she had not felt a divine power moving her to this that the prophecy of Deborah might be fulfilled. Nothing but this authority from God, of which she was certain, could warrant such a fact as this, which seemed a breach of hospitality, and to be attended with several other crimes; but was not so, when God, the Lord of all men's lives, ordered her to execute his sentence upon him." No one doubts that God is the Lord of all men's lives; but the good Bishop forgets that he has given no proof whatever that this act was done by order of the Almighty. We can think of only two grounds on which it can be contended that it was. First, that it is approved and praised by the prophetess Deborah; and, secondly, that it is inferred from belief in the plenary inspiration of the whole of the Bible. On the first point we must bear in mind that the fact of a man's bearing the prophetic character will not prove that he always acts in obedience to the Divine will. Balaam was a prophet, but he was a bad man. In the thirteenth chapter of the first book of Kings we find that a prophet was killed by a lion for his disobedience to a command of God. Dr. Priestley, who certainly was not a believer in the doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Bible, says of Jael's killing Sisera, "This act of treachery is not to be defended;" and again, "Whatever obligations the Israelites might be under to this woman, her treachery is not to be commended." If Dr. Priestley had to pass a moral judgment on a similar fact in Greek or Roman history, it would assuredly have been expressed in far stronger terms.

And now let us pause a little to consider what the probable effect of reading these two stories would have been on the minds of our two supposed readers. We fear that the unbeliever would have been confirmed in his infidelity; while the Christian, if he did not unhappily adopt the views of his companion, would be

led to question the divine authority of the books which contain these narrations. He would, we think, be reasonably led to ask the question, What foundation is there for the belief that the book of Judges was written under the unerring influence of divine inspiration? His first inquiry would naturally be, When and by whom was it written? To this no satisfactory answer can be given. Many divines suppose Samuel to be the author; but no convincing arguments have to our knowledge been produced in favour of this opinion. It seems most probable that this, and the other books of the Old Testament which were written before the captivity, existed at that time only in fragments, which were put together by Ezra, assisted no doubt by others, after the return of the Jews from Babylon, and that the Old Testament, except what was written afterwards, was put by them into the form in which we now have it. On what grounds, then, does the belief of their plenary inspiration rest? We see none but the fact of the Jews having admitted them into their canon, and of the established churches in the Christian world having given them the name of canonical, and asserting that they are all the word of God. Those who, adhering to the principle of the Reformation, the right of private judgment, deny the authority of any fallible men to decide in religious doctrines, will not be much moved by such claims. There are many other passages in the book of Judges on which we should make some comments, but want of space forbids it.

We will now ask the reader's attention to a few brief remarks on the Psalms. In the midst of the noblest effusions of piety, the most fervent aspirations after holiness, the humblest confession of sins committed, and the most deep-felt supplications for pardon, we meet with sentiments of hatred and revenge against enemies which cannot but astonish and afflict every pious mind, and make us disposed to ask, "Can these things be from God?"

We must content ourselves with referring to Psalms xxxv. 8, lviii. 6—8, 10, lix. 5, 12, 13, cxl. 9, 10. Two other passages will require some comment. Psalm cix. contains the most horrid imprecations against some one and his children. This has commonly been applied to an enemy of the writer of the Psalm; and if that interpretation be true, the writer must have been a person feeling the most malignant passion. Some, however, have endeavoured to give another turn to these texts, and we give their views of them in the words of a late learned and candid commentator:* "That such bitter imprecations as are contained in this Psalm should be uttered by David against any one of his enemies, has been a subject of astonishment and of distress to many pious and benevolent minds, and furnished the enemies of religion with matters for indecent scoffing. But, as Dr. Kennicott and other learned writers have suggested, the Psalm, when

* Wellbeloved's Translation of the Psalms, note.

rightly considered, may be found to contain no cause for the uneasiness of the friends of revelation, or for the triumph of the unbeliever. The imprecations are, most probably, not uttered by David against his enemies, but merely recited by him as the imprecations of his enemies against himself. He says in the beginning of the Psalm, that they surrounded him with words of hatred, and in return for his love were adverse to him; and near the conclusion says to Jehovah, 'Let them curse, but bless thou.' Take the curses which occupy the greater part of the Psalm as those which David's enemies uttered against him, and all is clear. And it is observable that David speaks of his enemies throughout the Psalm in the plural number, whereas the object of the imprecations is but one person." We can hardly think that this interpretation will be thought well founded, except by those who come to the perusal of the Psalms pre-determined to explain everything in the most favourable manner for its authors. The 20th verse, "Let this be the reward of mine adversaries from the Lord, and of them who speak evil against my soul," seems clearly to shew that the preceding imprecations proceeded from the Psalmist. Nor, assuming David to be the author of the Psalm, is it at all inconsistent with what we know of his character. He was evidently a man of the strongest passions, which were sometimes turned in a good and sometimes in an evil direction. We must not forget that on account of Nabal's evil conduct, David would have destroyed his whole family but for the prudent intercession of Abigail; nor that he committed adultery, and then procured the death of the innocent and injured husband.

Our last reference to the Psalms will be to the 137th, evidently written either during the captivity of the Jews in Babylon or after their return to Palestine. The last two verses run thus: "O daughter of Babylon, who art to be destroyed; happy shall he be that rewardeth thee as thou hast served us. Happy shall he be that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones." These words need no comment, and are directly opposed to the law of universal benevolence which we, as Christians, are bound to obey. But it may be said that the Israelites were living under an imperfect dispensation. Undoubtedly they were; but we cannot believe that sentiments of hatred and revenge are approved of and sanctioned in any dispensation coming from God. We are fully informed by our historians that many acts in direct violation of the principles of moral duty were perpetrated by the Puritans, and justified by the example of characters in the Old Testament. Juster views of religion now prevail, and the actions of these mistaken men, whose conduct we must in fairness admit to have been guided by sincere, however mistaken, religious principle, would now be almost universally condemned by all who call themselves Christians.

But we are told that if we reject the doctrine that the whole of the Bible is the word of God, we shall shake the foundations of the Christian religion and advance the cause of infidelity. Our answer is, that our belief in the truth of the religion of Jesus Christ is founded on a body of historical evidence which fully satisfies our reason; on the character of Jesus himself, so pure, so bright, so holy, so exalted, as far to transcend any supposed character which the most exalted genius has ever conceived and presented to the world; and on the unrivalled teachings of himself and his apostles, which set forth more sublime views of the Deity, and larger and juster principles of human duty, than were ever taught before, and which approve themselves to our noblest conceptions of religion and virtue. And with such irresistible marks of the Divine hand before us, are we to be told that if we sincerely believe that Jesus was sent into the world "to seek and to save that which was lost"—that he fully accomplished his mission—and if we receive him as the "one Mediator between God and man," and truly endeavour to shape our lives in conformity with his example and in obedience to his instructions—that we shall not deserve to be called Christians, and cannot be partakers of the benefits of our holy religion, because some things in the Jewish history appear to us to be incredible,—as that Abijah, king of Judah, with an army of four hundred thousand chosen men, went to battle with Jeroboam, king of Israel, who had an army of eight hundred thousand chosen men, and that the army of Abijah slew five hundred thousand of their enemies (2 Chron. xiii.); and that we feel perfectly certain that Ahaziah, the youngest son of Jehoram, king of Judah, could not have been two years older than his father, as is asserted in the same book? (xxii. xxiii.).

We fully believe that the law of Moses was given to the Israelites by divine authority, and that there is much in the Old Testament for which inspiration may be justly claimed, and we feel bound to admit the authority of the law and the prophets which our Lord acknowledged; but we have never met with satisfactory arguments to prove that the historical parts of it are to be considered in every particular literally true; or that the domestic stories of Ruth and Esther (in the latter of which the name of God is not found), the story or poem of Job, the discontented and sceptical philosophy of Ecclesiastes, and the amatory poem or poems called Solomon's Song, have any claim to be called the word of God.

It was Jesus Christ who brought life and immortality to light, and to whom alone the Spirit was given without measure. If the Old Testament had never been made known to the Gentiles, the history of the divine life of Jesus and the instructions of himself and his disciples contained in the New Testament would have given them ample means of becoming wise to salvation.

Indeed, long before any of the books of the New Testament were written, the Christian religion had made its way in many parts of the world, and had been accepted on most satisfactory grounds, and had produced the happiest results in the characters of those who received it. We are not called on to encounter the fiery trial to which they were exposed; but in the present as in all former ages, Christians are exposed to the dangers and temptations which arise from their evil passions and the evil examples around them, and need all the assistance and support which our heavenly religion affords us. May we receive the inestimable gift with humble and joyful thankfulness, and strive to be and to do all that it requires, to the salvation of our souls, the glory of our Creator and of him who was sent into the world to save sinners!

We have much more to say both with respect to the Old and the New Testament in connection with the doctrine of plenary inspiration, but we have already filled as much space as we ought to occupy.

L.

(To be continued.)

SPEECH OF THE REV. JAMES MARTINEAU AT THE LATE UNITARIAN ASSOCIATION ANNIVERSARY.

THE REV. JAMES MARTINEAU then proposed—"Our Brethren in Transylvania, may their Schools be strong in learning and their Churches devout; and may both be built on Freedom." He said that the duty of giving voice to this wish devolved upon him, by sad inheritance, as successor to one whom, during this generation, these annual meetings will never cease to recall;—his beloved fellow-student and friend Mr. Tagart, at the costly sacrifice of whose life they had been introduced to a more intimate knowledge of their brethren of Eastern Europe. The Unitarians of Transylvania, in common with themselves, represented a form of Protestant theology which history had unhappily thrown comparatively in the shade, but which was already touched by the opening lights of the future. So far as he understood the course of the Protestant reformation, it sought, from two opposite sides, an answer to the problem which Christianity undertook to solve. The common aim of Christianity, if he might express it in the most general terms, was to establish harmony between the human nature and the divine. It assumes that man and God are not without resources somewhere for love and communion, yet are kept apart by actual estrangement. It appeals to the sense of this sad distance, and finds in it the rudimental power, the essential element, of all Christian life. It further assumes that, while the fault is all on the human side, the remedy can come only from the divine; that the discord

can be resolved only by some mediating mind, at once true to the heavenly perfection and in fellowship with the earthly humiliation, and that in the person of Jesus Christ these conditions are fulfilled. But as to the mode in which that reconciliation was brought about, two solutions of the problem were offered. The divine might descend to be humanized; or the human might be lifted into participation of the divine life. One theology declared that the Infinite must stoop to assume the nature of man, and to take upon himself the sufferings, the temptations and the trials of man, and that only in this way was it possible that the broken links of sympathy should be re-united. In this incarnation, not only was the whole initiative with God, and the whole work supernatural, but the human element had no function except to afford the conditions of infirmity and death,—to give to the Ever-blessed a medium for the cry of anguish, and to the Eternal an opportunity to die. Nor was our nature held to be glorified by its selection as a divine abode: the union served for the humiliation of God; not for the consecration of humanity. The salvation was to be communicated to us without act or affection of ours, by pure Almighty grace, whose energy was directed to overcome and supersede our nature, and substitute a supernatural order of foreign desires and will. In this view, we are but helpless patients of a divine economy; and it is only by being conquered, suppressed, reduced to negation, by divine irruption, that we are susceptible of contact with infinite holiness. In reaction from the onesidedness of this theology, the problem was attempted from the other end: the questions were raised, whether, for its restoration, our nature need be absolutely quenched; whether sleeping susceptibilities were not still there which the indwelling grace might wake into new life and power; whether, in Christ, the divine elements were not simply added on to a primary humanity which they consecrated and perfected; and whether, in our hearts, subdued already by that fair image, the living Spirit of God might not win some true response, and find a natural and congenial abode. In the affirmative reply to these questions consisted the humanitarian theology. These two systems were diametrically opposite. The latter conciliated, the former opposed religion and life. The latter united the world with that which was divine, consecrated every element within it, and enabled us to feel that we trod upon holy ground in the daily duties of existence. The former fostered the utmost antipathy and opposition between the secular and the spiritual, placed men in opposition to God, and required them to take a leap and spring out of nature before they could realize the ends of revelation. In the Reformation of the 16th century, the Augustinian scheme laid such powerful hold both upon Luther and Calvin, that they, as leaders of the movement, carried with them the great mass of the clergy, and the humanitarian theology was outvoted and put

down. Nevertheless even then, among quiet and studious men, who were not carried away with the hot enthusiasm of those who were first liberated from the thralldom of Catholicism, it found a few retreats. It was in Italy, the country in which religious speculation was least likely to follow a German lead, that the humanitarian theology first betrayed its existence. At a literary club in Vicenza, the elder Socinus, the fervent Capucin, Ochino, the noble Neapolitan, Gentile, discussed and shaped the heresy; but though their meetings were secret, the inquisitor's eye was upon them and his ear within hearing of their words, and they were obliged to disperse and seek safety beyond the Alps. A little later, we find the same associates,—with the addition of the physician Blandrata, and the substitution of the younger for the elder Socinus,—gathered into a church, and meeting week by week for worship and teaching essentially like our own. But the frown of Calvin watched them; and they knew from the recent ashes of Servetus what that dark look portended. One of them, indeed, was destined in a few years to swell the Swiss reformer's account of persecution. For in 1558, Gentile was, at Calvin's instigation, stripped to his shirt, and compelled, old as he was, to walk through the city bare-foot and bare-headed, in penitential habit, and with torch in hand; and to cast into the flames as blasphemous the writings in which he had taught the supremacy of the Father over the Son. It was but the prelude to his last sacrifice: in a few years more, he was beheaded for his heresy at Berne. Then it was that Blandrata, not ambitious of his friend's crown of martyrdom, betook himself to Cracow, and with Faustus Socinus, gave the Reformation there a strong impulse in the direction of his own theology. Crossing over to Transylvania, he exercised a similar influence at Clausenburg; using in both countries his influence as Court-physician to incline the nobles and cultivated classes to his faith. Though, in the next century, this doubtful advantage was lost by a reaction of jesuitry in the old church and of Calvinism in the new, yet in Transylvania a fundamental law, operative to this hour, had been secured, recognizing the Unitarian faith among the four religions protected by the State. Such was the history of the early settlement of our form of Christianity in the east of Europe; and it was remarkable that in its progress its most congenial friends were found in the three countries of Italy, Poland and Hungary, which in our own day represented the spirit of growing freedom. It was remarkable to find the thrill of Christian sympathy thus extending from the south of Europe to the north-east, and then again to the borders of Turkish empire. If, three centuries ago, when the difficulties of communication were enormous, the brotherhood of faith could thus make light of the barriers of nature, language and society, it would indeed be a reproach to us to drop the links of intercourse that were so hard

to fasten, and are so easy to repair. Shall we multiply all other ties, and let the religious alone decay? Shall we invent electric wires, to report the price of stocks or the last folly of a king, and lose the ancient threads of moral sympathy? It was well to guard sacredly our not too ample treasure of historical association. A noble history to a church was much like what a noble ancestry was to a family—keeping them in the paths of faithfulness and virtue; and it was impossible for Unitarians to call to mind the sufferings and martyrdom of the early humanitarian Christians, without resolving to be true and faithful to their convictions, both in simply avowing them and in spreading them through the world. He asked them to help in re-laying the network of living sympathies by which their ancient churches were bound together. The Unitarian Association had happily restored many a broken or neglected thread. Their Report contained few more interesting features than the letter of the good Transylvanian Bishop, detailing the affairs of his Consistory, and the hopeful entrance of our friend M. Simén on his responsible career. May his residence among us be the first of many living links between us and the church of Hungary! In truth, we had invited this design, and must not recede. By years of correspondence, by personal missions, by even a fatal sacrifice to the establishment of good offices, we had pledged ourselves to see this Christian alliance ratified. Mr. Henry Bicknell had proposed some time ago to raise a special fund as a memorial to Mr. Tagart, and bearing that revered name. It was felt then that the time was hardly ripe for such a movement, as it was not then known whether their Transylvanian brethren could send students over here; but from the information which they now possessed, he thought that Mr. Bicknell's proposal now fell due. The region where the Transylvanian brethren live was called by the Germans who gave it its name the *Siebenbürgen*,—the Seven Fortresses, raised against the Ottoman power, on to the territory of which its rivers flow and its heights look down. That once threatening danger is past. But we may help them still to garrison their mountain station against the undying barbarism of error and intolerance; to enclose with a peaceful cordon of learning and piety, and guard with a sacred band of good soldiers of Jesus Christ, their ancient soil of free worship, and maintain for God's husbandry the field which has so long received the pure seed of the word. The apostle Paul thought it fitting to appeal to the Western churches of his Gentile mission for the poor saints of Jerusalem. Transylvania, regarded as the scene of the humanitarian Christianity in its early and struggling years, was in some sense our Jerusalem; and it was incumbent on us to turn our face to the East, and extend a generous help to the venerable church on the mountain boundary of European Protestantism.

ADDRESS DELIVERED IN UNIVERSITY HALL, JUNE 24, 1863, BY
REV. SAMUEL BACHE, AT THE CLOSE OF THE ANNUAL EXA-
MINATION OF THE STUDENTS OF MANCHESTER NEW COLLEGE.

GENTLEMEN,

I HAD hoped on this occasion to share with you the privilege of listening to a friend, to whose valuable instruction and training in those very important departments of knowledge and discipline which must ever lie at the foundation of an efficient intellectual culture, your own learned Professors and many other of the most distinguished pastors of our church were indebted, together with myself, for advantages which we feel, in grateful retrospect, that we cannot too highly appreciate or too thankfully acknowledge. But for unexpected hindrances, the Rev. John Kenrick, of York, would have addressed you to-day. Most earnestly do I desire, for your sakes not less than my own, that the opportunity of receiving the counsels of his eminent culture and more extended experience may be only for a season deferred.

The examination through which you have just passed is a practical testimony to the unwavering conviction of your friends, the Professors and Supporters of this free Institution, that an accurate and comprehensive intellectual culture is an indispensable preparation for the work of the Christian ministry, to which it is your deliberate purpose to devote yourselves. Let me endeavour very briefly to set before you some of the practical issues of such culture which you will do well to contemplate, in order that you may adequately prepare to meet them. I mention them not as unknown to you, but as, I trust, already well known, in order that you may be encouraged to assign to them their just practical importance.

The inquiry after truth and the investigation of it is reckoned by the philosophic Cicero among the chief of the distinguishing prerogatives of man.* This glorious prerogative you are here trained to exercise; and this in connection with that science which has been justly called the queen and mistress of all the sciences, inasmuch as it receives tribute from all and exercises over all a just supremacy—I mean the science of Theology. In the prosecution of this science, your attention is specially devoted, as candidates for the Christian ministry, to the study of the Gospel records, forasmuch as “in them you think you have eternal life.” The clear exposition of these records, the faithful application of those divine instructions and encouragements which they contain to the practical uses of life, constitute the great and characteristic work of the Christian ministry for which you are here making special preparation, and which, as long as

* In primisque hominis est propria veri inquisitio atque investigatio. (De Officiis, i. 4.)

you are enabled to carry it on, will never cease to demand from you the vigorous and persevering exercise of all your powers of thought and discrimination, both for the clear apprehension and earnest recommendation of sacred truth. Remember that every inquiry and investigation *ought* to commence with a clear definition of its object, in order that we may thoroughly understand what it is that we are seeking,—a precept of the same philosophic Cicero,* which many inquirers and disputants of the present day would do well to observe, and of which I hope that you, my friends, will never lose sight.

But no inquiry after truth, especially in connection with religion, can ever be efficiently conducted except in the exercise of complete, unbiassed and unfettered freedom of thought. This is the normal condition, ordained by Providence, of our healthful and progressive spiritual life,—a condition, therefore, which every one of us is under the most sacred obligation to maintain himself and to respect in others. It cannot be really maintained, however, except in connection with earnest and persevering exertions for the use and improvement of it. Being free, we must *use* our freedom if we would preserve it; and it appears to me that a confident belief that there *is* truth to be discovered, and that the discovery of it is actually within our power, is indispensable as a motive and encouragement to faithful free inquiry. Let us not—any more than the illustrious Roman philosopher to whom I have already made repeated reference†—let us not be of the number of those to whom nothing ever appears to be true; but of those who see and know that every truth which it is possible for our limited and imperfect powers to apprehend, has its alloy of error; so that, out of the circle of pure mathematics, *moral* certainty, which is in fact the highest moral probability, is the only certainty which we can attain.

This moral certainty is, however, to be our guide in life, requiring for its application the habitual union of confidence and humility. As Ministers of the Gospel, we can accomplish nothing if we are not fully persuaded in our own minds of the truths which we teach. We are under the necessity of treating them as absolute and final, to the extent of our own present convictions; only let us never forget that our clearest and strongest convictions *may be* erroneous, and that while we are constrained to act upon them to-day, we must not presume *confidently* to anticipate what they may be to-morrow, because we know not

* Omnis, enim, quæ a ratione suscipitur de aliquâ re institutio, debet a definitione proficisci; ut intelligatur quid sit id de quo disputetur. (De Officiis, i. 2.)

† Non enim sumus ii quibus nihil verum esse videatur, sed ii qui omnibus veris falsa quædam adjuncta esse dicamus, tantâ similitudine ut in iis nulla insit certa judicandi et assentiendi nota. Ex quo existit et illud, multa esse probabilia; quæ quanquam non perciperentur, tamen quia visum haberent quendam insignem et illustrem, his sapientis vita regeretur. (De Nat. Deor. i. 5.)

what new and unexpected light it may please God to grant us. Such was the habitual sentiment of my illustrious predecessor, Dr. Priestley; than whom few men have ever exhibited a more instructive and engaging example of the union of clear and firm and practical conviction of truth with the preservation of a mind ever open for the reception of new light, and a heart ever overflowing with charity and goodwill toward all his brethren in Christ and of mankind.

And be sure, my friends, that as the result of your conscientious individual inquiry after religious truth, you will every one of you be compelled to take up, more or less, an insulated position. "As many men, so many minds," says the proverb; and the minds are individually as separate and distinguished from each other as the men. Hence he who came into the world to bear witness to the truth distinctly avowed that he came to bring, not peace, but division. "Peace through division" is, therefore, the doctrine of the gospel, being the doctrine of our common humanity, as eloquently set forth and illustrated by one of your own learned Professors many years ago, both in his pulpit exhortations and—to his honour be it spoken—in his life. Diversities of opinion there always must be among men: they are the divinely appointed means and aids to the discovery of truth. Each man occupying the place appointed for him by Providence, applies his powers and opportunities to the investigation of both the works and the ways of God within the range of his observation, and to the endeavour to bring his mind and will into conformity with the divine; but as both his powers and opportunities are exceedingly limited and imperfect in comparison with the infinite extension and perfection of these subjects of investigation, he can know only in part, and should be content therefore to prophesy only in part; i.e. to give clear utterance to his own most deliberate and sincere convictions, in the assurance that these convictions must be to some extent distinctively his own and cannot be precisely entertained by any one else. As in the investigations of physical science, so in all inquiries after truth of every sort, let us each one carefully observe and honestly report for himself; in order that by subsequent comparison of the results of independent inquiry and observation, individual errors may be corrected and defects supplied; to which end nothing more effectually contributes than the very diversities which, as we have already seen, are necessarily occasioned by the confessedly limited power and range of observation of every separate individual. It is folly, therefore, not liberality, to slur over these diversities. We should rather aim to bring them out, as materials for thought and inquiry, as clearly as possible. Wherefore writes Goethe, "We should be strict, i.e. exact in our opinions, liberal in our sentiments,"—a maxim which in the world around us we see too frequently reversed, especially in connection with subjects of the

greatest importance. Our faith in relation to every subject of thought and inquiry, to be worthy of the name, must be our own; and we are exhorted by St. Paul to hold it, not in uniformity of opinion, which is impossible, but in unity of spirit and in the bond of peace.

It is of the very greatest importance to the efficient exercise of the Christian ministry, that this union of clear and exact individual thought with the most enlarged and generous sentiments towards others, should be distinctly understood and practically maintained. What is the use of all the elaborate provision which is here made for your intellectual instruction and culture in connection with religious truth and its sacred records, if the moment you enter on the work of the Christian ministry, you are to be required to repudiate the results of this culture and instruction wherever they would interfere with sectarian union and co-operation? I deeply feel, what I have often been compelled to say and desire now to place upon record, that it is chiefly my solemn and increasing conviction of the necessity of perfect spiritual simplicity and freedom to the growth and culture of the spiritual life, which keeps me out of the pale of our Established Church, or of that more ancient Church to which our present Establishment itself stands in the relation of Dissenting; for I will yield to no man in my love of order and method, or in that spirit of loyalty which rejoices in the reverential acknowledgment of all lawfully constituted authority, and which makes a man feel himself never more truly man than when he bows in heartfelt submission and devotion before the throne of the Most High God. If I read aright the signs of the times, there is an urgent necessity for our thoughtful recurrence to the great principles on which this Collegiate Institution was originally established, in order to preserve to our churches the benefits of high intellectual culture in connection with religious truth and duty, and that normal condition of spiritual freedom which is indispensable to the healthy maintenance and development of our spiritual life. Union is strength where it is the result of free and unaffected harmony of principles and sympathies; but wherever such harmony does not actually subsist, it is no longer strength, but tyranny on the side that would enforce it, and slavery on that which would accept it. After two centuries of restless suffering, eliciting at frequent intervals an audible cry for deliverance, our Church Establishment is now, I trust, passing through its final struggles for liberation from the atrocious Act of Uniformity; not that any such liberation could ever satisfy my individual conception of the demands of spiritual freedom, but that, I thank God! I can heartily desire to see men useful and happy in their own way and rejoice with them in their success, even at the very time when I feel myself constrained by my own convictions of truth and duty to protest against that way and endeavour to

point out what I believe to be its errors or defects. Far be it from us ever to repress the promptings of our generous sympathies except where they would tempt us to violate our individual convictions. No clearer or more solemn truth is, in my judgment, to be found within the whole compass of the Christian revelation than that which Jesus, our divine Master, taught throughout his public life and sealed by his ignominious and agonizing death,—viz. that the most effectual way in which it is possible for any man to serve and, as in his instance, to save his fellow-men, is by setting before them in his own person a consistent example of simplicity and godly sincerity, hoping all things and enduring all things for the advancement of that sacred cause of divine truth for which our great Teacher and Forerunner lived and died.

May you, my friends, ever prosecute your sacred studies with the great end in view of fitting yourselves to become *teachers* of Christian truth! It is because Christianity is true that Christ required that its ministers should be *teachers*. Not such were the priests as ministers of religion among the heathen, nor to any great extent under the Mosaic dispensation; but now that, in the Christian church, the race of apostles and prophets (in the sense of inspired predictors) is extinct, the office of pastors and teachers yet remains “for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the full stature of Christ;” and “speaking the truth in love, grow up into him in all things, who is the head, even Christ” (Ephes. iv. 13, 15).

Labour diligently, therefore, to attain an intelligent, exalted, quickening and sanctifying faith in the great spiritual realities to the maintenance and inculcation of which it is your purpose, in reliance on God's gracious aid, to devote yourselves. Nothing short of such faith will be sufficient to qualify you for your work, but such faith *will* be sufficient. It was no easy duty which the Macedonian conqueror imposed on his chamberlain when he required him every morning to address to him the warning admonition, “Philip, remember that thou art a man.” Yet how important was the faithful fulfilment of that duty to the monarch himself, and how honourable to the officer who had the courage to discharge it! So in the ministry of the gospel for which you are here making preparation, the distinct and intelligent utterance, the faithful and fearless maintenance of its sacred truths is not at all times easy, but it is at all times right and ennobling. We live in what is not now so much a mechanical as a sensational age, and things are done more with a view to immediate and striking impression than to final benefit. Hence arise strong temptations to make principle subordinate to temporary expedi-

ency, reality to ostentation. This tendency is to be steadily resisted with a view to its correction, and the supremacy of truth and freedom is to be always faithfully vindicated and maintained. May God enable you to qualify yourselves for this high and holy work, and, when you enter upon it, to prosecute it faithfully through life! Thus may you ever shew forth the purity and power of your Christian faith; and rejoicing in the gratefully avowed experience of St. Paul, "I am sufficient for all things through Him that strengtheneth me," thus may you save both yourselves and them that hear you; thus may you evermore ascribe to Him, the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only God, glory in the highest, through Jesus Christ his Son!

CRITICAL NOTICES.

Calumnies Confuted: Historical Facts in answer to the Quarterly Review on the Bicentenary Commemoration. With an Appendix, shewing the True Character of the Act of Uniformity, 1662. By Joshua Wilson. Pp. 112. London—Jackson, Walford and Hodder. 1863.

MR. WILSON was one of those wealthy and zealous Congregationalists who joined in celebrating the recent anniversary by their munificent contributions to a splendid Bicentenary Fund. He now executes another work, for which all right-minded Nonconformists will cordially thank him. In exposing the calumnious statements of the Quarterly reviewer on the Bicentenary commemoration, he has produced an historical treatise of considerable value, in which he illustrates the heroic courage and right doing of the fathers of English Nonconformity, and exposes the wanton injustice of the Act of Uniformity, which two centuries ago drove them from the National Church and from "homes which they loved." The blunder made by clerical writers like the Quarterly reviewer, in identifying the cause of the Established Church of the present day with that pursued by the intolerant and revengeful statesmen and prelates of the Restoration era, is very surprising. So many clergymen of the highest note, and other writers whom the clergy profess to hold in honour (Mr. Coleridge for instance), had expressed their disapprobation of the exclusive and tyrannical procedure of the Sheldons, Morleys and Gunnings, that ample and safe precedents existed for a tolerant and liberal utterance, and even for some degree of sympathy with the descendants of the early Nonconformists on the occasion of the Bicentenary anniversary. We imagine that the munificent subscription of the Congregationalists, and the announced purpose of expending it in part in furthering the cause of Evangelical Dissent, has been the main cause of the spiteful ire of many Church lecturers and writers. So far as we have observed, the Evangelical clergy have been the most angry among the writers on their side. But the offensive article in the Quarterly (on which we made some remarks at the time of its appearance) compromises in an almost equal degree the High-church party.

The character of the publications of the Conformist party on this

occasion is thus severely, but not unjustly, described by Mr. Wilson: they are "little else than effusions of spleen, ebullitions of angry feeling, dealing largely in positive assertions, unsupported by historical evidence,—marked, in short, either by gross ignorance or wilful perversion of the real facts." Before taking in hand the Quarterly article, Mr. Wilson replies to some of the charges of other assailants. Two clergymen, of the names of Venables and Bardsley, have made it one of the charges against Nonconformity, that of the original Nonconformist meeting-houses, almost every one (so they say) has fallen into the hands of the "Socinians." In order to give a little colour to this charge, Mr. Venables begins by reducing the number of Nonconformist meeting-houses, which he sets down "at most but 331." The precision of the statement is amusing. Mr. Bardsley takes them at a lesser figure, "from 200 to 300." Now how stands the fact? When, after ten years of persecution, in 1672, the Indulgence was declared, about 3000 licences for Nonconformist ministers and places of worship were applied for. Of this fact, it is stated, there exists documentary evidence in the Register kept in the Privy Council Office. It is not supposed that the number of meeting-houses built after the Revolution was at all equal. The late Rev. Joseph Hunter estimated the early growth of Nonconformist places of worship in England at between 1000 and 1100. As to the number that have descended to Unitarians, Mr. Venables declares that nearly all the 331 are to be reckoned. Mr. Bardsley affects to be more precise, and says that "not twenty" of the original places are now possessed by the Independents and Baptists. Mr. Wilson, on the authority of Mr. Hunter, estimates the number of old chapels in the possession of Unitarians at 150. We believe this estimate is an excessive one. As far as England is concerned, the number probably does not exceed 130. We will not stop to analyze the worth of the argument against Nonconformity that it has let in Unitarianism. The use of such a fact was of course an appeal to theological intolerance. But, in truth, the argument does not tell against Nonconformity more than it does against Protestantism. Wherever the Bible has been used as a guide to faith, there in some of its various forms the Unitarian faith has arisen. Mr. Wilson is well known to be an uncompromising opponent of our religious doctrines, and does not offer any defence against this special charge, beyond its gross exaggeration as to numbers. But we have to acknowledge his justice in giving us the name we adopt, and passing by the nickname used by the clerical assailants of Nonconformity.

The points of assault selected by the Quarterly reviewer and seriatim replied to by Mr. Wilson are these: 1. That the ejected clergy were intruders. 2. That they were the authors of all the revolutionary troubles of the quarter of a century that preceded the Restoration. 3. That they made war against episcopacy, and hunted it down with unrelenting hatred. 4. That between 6000 and 7000 of orthodox clergymen were sequestered in the Commonwealth times and exposed to pitiable destitution. Mr. Wilson next proceeds to defend Nonconformists of modern times from the series of wild and uncharitable censures penned by the Quarterly reviewer. Not the least valuable part of this elaborate pamphlet will be found in the last fifty pages, in which the true character of the Act of Uniformity is described, and the author's positions are strengthened by quotations from the writings of eminent clergymen and other

members of the Established Church. In this remarkable list we find the names of Sir Matthew Hale, John Locke, Bishop Burnet, Archdeacon Hare, Dr. Adam Clarke, Rev. J. C. Ryle, Rev. D. Mountfield, Rev. J. B. Marsden, Dr. Miller, Rev. Isaac Taylor, Rev. Robert Machray, Bishop Short and Bishop Baring.

We do not find ourselves able to agree with all Mr. Wilson's positions. We should be disposed to make larger concessions than he has done to the Church party as to the indefensible and persecuting character of some of the Puritans and Nonconformists. We have, of course, no sympathy with the objections he takes to some things in the theology of Bishop Jeremy Taylor. But, as a whole, Mr. Wilson has conducted the defence of Nonconformists and their principles with large knowledge and a due catholicity of spirit, and is entitled to the respectful acknowledgment of those who value English Nonconformity as an embodiment of the principles of civil and religious liberty, and as a strong buttress of true and spiritual religion. We select the closing paragraphs of his work as a specimen of his style and spirit.

"In reply to the question, How can ecclesiastical peace be restored to England? I answer confidently, Not by any longer engaging in the pursuit of what Dr. Arnold calls 'the phantom uniformity,' which, he says, 'has been our curse ever since the Reformation,' and 'has lured men from the attainment of the real substantial blessing—union.'

"Locke, in his 'Third Letter on Toleration,' says, 'They who talk so much of sects and divisions would do well to consider whether those are not most authors and promoters of sects and divisions who impose creeds, ceremonies, and articles of men's making, and make things not necessary to salvation, the necessary terms of communion; excluding and driving from them such as out of conscience and persuasion cannot assent and submit to them, and treating them as if they were utter aliens from the Church of God, and such as were deservedly shut out as unfit to be members of it; who narrow Christianity within bounds of their own making, and which the Gospel knows nothing of; and often, for things by themselves confessed indifferent, thrust men out of their communion, and then punish them for not being of it. Who sees not that the bond of unity might be preserved, in the different persuasions of men concerning things not necessary to salvation, if they were not made necessary to church communion?'

"A venerable divine of the seventeenth century, Jeremiah Burroughes, in a book entitled, 'Irenicum: to the Lovers of Truth and Peace,' 4to, 1646, mentions the following remarkable fact:—

"I find an excellent passage in an epistle of Isaac Casaubon to Cardinal Perron, which he wrote in the name of King James [I.] by his command: 'The king thinks that the things that are absolutely necessary to salvation are not many; therefore His Majesty is of that mind, that there is no shorter way for peace than first by severing necessary things from things that are not necessary, and then to labour a full agreement in those; but as for things not necessary, let them be left to Christian liberty.' And again, 'These necessary things are few, and the king thinks this distinction to be of so great moment to lessen the controversies which this day do so exceedingly trouble the Church, that all who study peace should most diligently explicate, teach, and urge this.'

"This means of attaining ecclesiastical peace and unity was explicated, taught, and urged by Baxter and Howe; but, alas! without success. Is not the time now come for this excellent royal advice to be reduced to practice,—for the Act of Uniformity of 1662 to be wholly repealed or greatly modified, and for the Liturgy to be effectually reformed?"—Pp. 111, 112.

To the Pyramids: being Two Lectures delivered in St. Paul's School, Stayley, in the Years 1861 and 1862. By William H. Harrison, Esq. Pp. 100. Manchester, 1863.

MR. FERRAND recently tried to reawaken in the House of Commons the Tory cheers which years ago were the echo to his denunciations of the cotton capitalists. But his vituperations had no longer any charm. Those whom he addressed had learnt that cotton-spinners do not materially differ from the great mass of English capitalists. If they have sordid, ignorant and heartless men among them, there are also the intelligent, kind-hearted and generous. The pleasing little volume of which we give the title above is the work of a cotton-master, and was delivered to a large and deeply-interested assembly, composed mainly of his father's "hands." The Lectures are a lively and instructive narrative of the author's journey and voyage from Lancashire to Egypt, and an account of what he saw there. Two popular lecturers in London just now begin by assuring their hearers that "not one word of instruction shall pass their lips during their two hours' talk." Mr. Harrison was not the man to make such a promise, or, if he had made it, to keep it. We wish, in this time of enforced leisure and anxious care, the "hands" in every cotton manufacturing village in Lancashire had the opportunity of hearing lectures as good as these. We do not doubt that the closing periods of the lecture were drowned in those energetic sounds which Lancashire "hands" know how to give, and which what used to be called the "Kentish fire" did not surpass in heartiness. We select as a specimen of Mr. Harrison's style his account of a religious service of the Dervishes at Cairo on the Mohammedan sabbath, our Friday.

"One week they howl and the next dance, whence the name Howling or Dancing Dervishes. This was the week for howling. The place of meeting is in Old Cairo, and consists of two halls, one being the vestibule to the other; both are dome-roofed. Round the plain white walls were hung gongs, small drums, and tambourines, while skins of animals are placed in a circle, on which the devotees perform the service. They generally muster about twenty, the head Dervish sitting at one side with his back to a recess in the wall. This singular form of worship began by all of them rising from their resting posture, and gently rocking their bodies side-ways, some singing a few words, while others murmured in a low tone. A regulated gradation in the increase of the melody and movements seems to be the principal characteristic of the ceremony. The melody, if such it could be called, soon increased to a great loudness. As it swelled into a shout, two or three of the performers seize the drums and cymbals, thus adding to the uproar by playing thereon. After this the singing ceases, and is succeeded by a deep breathing which lasts several minutes; then the whole assemblage rise to their feet, and commence rocking themselves backwards and forwards, one in the centre keeping time with such energy as we have seen the immortal Jullien conduct his immense orchestra. The turbans dropped from the heads of the most energetic, their long black hair flying about in all directions. The meeting finished by a dervish moving backwards out of the circle, whilst at every step making a profound bow to the chief."—Pp. 95, 96.

The Riots at Birmingham, July, 1791. Birmingham—A. B. Matthews. 1863.

THIS memorial of one of the saddest and most disgraceful scenes in English history, consists of a reprint of a pamphlet published shortly after the riots, and of Witton's views of the ruins, with their accompa-

nying descriptions. The views are transferred to stone from the original mezzotint plates. The illustrations include a wood-cut of the Old Meeting-house previous to its destruction in 1791, and lithographs of the ruins of the New Meeting-house; of Dr. Priestley's house at Fair Hill; of Baskerville House, the residence of Mr. Ryland; of Bordesley Hall, the seat of Mr. Taylor; of the house of Mr. Hutton at Saltley; of Spark-Brook, the house of Mr. Humphrys; of the house of Mr. Russell, Showell Green; and of Moseley Hall, the residence of Lady Carhampton.

The New Meeting, which was the first object of the rioters' attack, is thus described :

"This edifice, erected in the year 1730, was a considerable pile; its walls lofty and substantial; in so much as to have survived the rage of the flames, and the still fiercer and more dangerous fury of the mob. It was more remarkable for plainness and simplicity than for any uncommon elegance of workmanship, or superb style of decorations; compared, however, with buildings of the same name and date, it had few if any equals in the kingdom. The vestry contained a valuable collection of books, for the use of the society which assembled there. This structure, after having existed upwards of sixty years, was doomed to fall the first sacrifice to the pitiable madness of the refuse of mankind: it was assaulted with incredible fury, and in a few hours reduced to the state of which the plate gives an accurate representation. From this place the mob proceeded to the Old Meeting, which was completely rased to its foundations."

In the publisher's Preface we have these historical details :

"In 1692 the second Presbyterian Meeting-house was opened, under the name of the Lower Meeting-house, by some of the members of the Old-Meeting congregation, who separated in consequence of doctrinal differences, in a spot still bearing the name of Meeting-house Yard. Like the other, it was attacked in 1715; the mob, however, sparing the walls, on a promise being made by the landlord (it was not the property of the congregation) that it should be put to other uses. The building, of which a portion yet remains, has since been used as a workshop. The congregation, thus compelled to remove, purchased in 1727 for £40 a piece of land about 32 yards by 20, situated on the northern side of a narrow lane now called New-Meeting Street; here they erected the New Meeting-house, which was opened April 1732. In 1764 the Trustees purchased, for £225, the three houses and land which were between the building and Moor Street; the houses were removed, and an open space obtained in front of the Meeting-house. The celebrated Dr. Joseph Priestley was appointed a pastor of the place in 1780, and remained so till 1791, when he was driven away by the disgraceful proceedings of that year. During the rebuilding of the Old and New Meeting-houses, both congregations worshipped together in a chapel in Livery Street, (on part of the site now occupied by Billing's printing-office,) which they designated the Union Meeting-house. The register of the New Meeting-house having been lost, the society could not recover damages from the hundred; but, after much delay, obtained £2000 from the Government towards the erection of the new building, which was opened July 22nd, 1802, to accommodate 1200 persons. The strip of land in New-Meeting Street adjoining the Meeting-house was purchased in 1808, for a term of 500 years, for £400; here the school buildings were subsequently erected. Some of the members of the congregation desiring the place of worship and the schools to be removed nearer Edgbaston, several meetings were held in 1857 and 1858 to decide upon the subject; and in this latter year, on October 12th, at a meeting of the seat-renting members, held at twelve o'clock at noon, it was determined that the 'chapel and schools' should be 'removed' to Broad Street. By a very small majority the resolution was carried—'That the Trustees be requested to take such measures for

disposing of the present chapel, schools and property in New-Meeting Street as may appear to them expedient; and that the Committee now appointed be authorized to give such consent, on the part of the Congregation, to all legal measures for effecting such sale, or for appropriating the purchase moneys to accrue therefrom, towards the new chapel and schools, as may be deemed necessary by the Trustees, or by the Court of Chancery, if it shall be found expedient to apply to that Court.'

"The New Meeting-house was privately sold to a Roman Catholic congregation in or about August, 1861, for £3500; and the last Unitarian service was conducted there on Sunday, December 29th, 1861. The site in Broad Street, previously referred to, consists in the right of building over the canal at the corner of St. Peter's Place; and there an elegant Gothic church and school-rooms have been built, which were duly opened on New-Year's-Day, 1862, under the name 'Church of the Messiah.' To this building the memorial tablets of Priestley and others have been removed. The closing and sale of the New Meeting-house caused much regret to many members of the congregation. Its central situation, large size, and the populous neighbourhood in which it was situated, combined to make it a most desirable place for a mission chapel and schools; while its associations with Priestley rendered the area in front of it the most fitting site for a statue of that noble man,—noble alike for his learning, his religion, and his moral virtues,—of whose unflinching devotion to what he believed to be the truth of God, we feel assured, Birmingham will yet make a public recognition."

Is it asked, Why perpetuate memorials of acts which were a disgrace to civilization? the answer is, Such memorials may serve as a warning against religious bigotry, and of the danger of enlisting the passions of the ignorant on the side of a political party. When the citizens of Birmingham shall with one voice testify their sense of the greatness of Dr. Priestley, and of the enormous wrong done by the riots of 1791, not only to him, but to civil and religious liberty, to science and to truth, we will gladly consent to bury in oblivion that dark page of local and national history. We have lived to see a statue erected at Oxford: how many years must elapse before a similar testimonial is offered by Birmingham?

What is Salvation? By Henry W. Crosskey.

THERE is at Glasgow a local Unitarian Missionary Association. They have organized a tract-distributing agency in connection with the St. Vincent-Street Unitarian church, and have published this short and effective tract as the first fruits of their organization. It is a tract which may well set those a-thinking who have known religion only in its harsher forms and as a mere system of dogmas, and will certainly conciliate the respect of wise and kind-hearted readers to the more benignant and practical system of faith which Unitarians accept as the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Bessy's Money: a Tale. By the Author of "Mary Powell." Pp. 72. London—Arthur Hall and Co. 1863.

A WELL-TOLD tale of humble domestic virtue and the heroic assertion of Protestant truth in the dark days of Queen Mary.

OBITUARY.

DR. CONVERS FRANCIS.

We regret to record the decease of CONVERS FRANCIS, D.D., late Parkman Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and Pastoral Care in Harvard University, Cambridge, near Boston. He was the fourth child and second son of Convers and Susanna (Rand) Francis; and was born in West Cambridge, 9th of November, 1795. He graduated at Harvard College in 1815, in the same class with President Jared Sparks, John Gorham Palfrey, Professor Theophilus Parsons and Hon. John A. Lowell. He held a distinguished rank of scholarship in college. After graduating, he studied theology at the Cambridge Divinity School; and was ordained pastor of the Unitarian church in Watertown, 23rd of January, 1819, where he remained twenty-three years. In 1842, he was chosen Professor of Pulpit Eloquence and the Pastoral Care in Harvard College; which office he accepted, and held the professorship until his death. He was a laborious and successful teacher, and discharged his duties with eminent fidelity and wisdom.

A large number of his writings have been published: among them were "Errors of Education," a discourse at the Anniversary of the Derby Academy in Hingham, 21st May, 1828; Address on the 4th of July, 1828, at Watertown; An Historical Sketch of Watertown, from the first Settlement of the Town to the close of the Second Century, in 1830; A Discourse at Plymouth, 22nd December, 1832; A Dudleian Lecture at Cambridge, 8th May, 1833; The Life of Rev. John Eliot, the Apostle to the Indians, in the fifth volume of Sparks's American Biography, 1836; The Life of Sebastian Rask, Missionary to the Indians, in the seventh volume, new series, of Sparks's American Biography, 1845; Memoir of Rev. John Allyn, D.D., of Duxbury, 1836; Memoir of Dr. Gamaliel Bradford, 1846; Memoir of Judge Davis, 1849 (the last three were published in the Collections of the Massachusetts Historical Society); many articles in the "Christian Disciple," the "Christian Examiner," the "American Monthly Review," the "Unitarian Advocate," the "Scriptural Interpreter," the "Juvenile Miscellany;" several translations from Herder at different times; obituary notice of Miss Eliza Townsend, 1854; and a large number of occasional discourses. He was a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society. In 1837, the honorary degree of Doctor of

Divinity was conferred upon him by Harvard College.

The following tribute to his character we take from the new number of the Monthly Journal of the American Unitarian Association:

"Dr. Convers Francis was a man who was loved by all who knew him. It did not seem to be in him to make or have an enemy. Friendly and genial to all, enjoying social intercourse, and giving joy by his expansive sympathy, he was as happy as a child in his work and in his circumstances. While a minister at Watertown, his preaching attracted numbers, not so much by any charm of manner, nor by any great originality of statement, as by its healthy, cheerful and progressive tone. The writer of this, then a boy of twelve years, used to walk two miles from Newton Centre to Watertown, as a matter of choice, on Sundays, to hear Dr. Francis. To be sure, the alternative was to go to the old parish church in Newton, and listen to Dr. Jonathan Homer, who, in those years, had already, in his pulpit exercises, left far behind all thought of making himself intelligible to his audience; and discoursed to himself, in a sort of sing-song way, about his Bible, about his discoveries in tracing the origin of the present version, about the conversations he had lately had, and about any other topic which happened to enter into his somewhat inconsequential train of thought; so that I and my brothers, though schoolboys, were very glad to walk to Watertown, even on a hot day, over a dusty road, to hear the fresh thoughts and genial sentiments and warm-hearted utterances of Dr. Francis. His library, in those days, was a curiosity and treasure; for it contained German books. He was a great reader; he plunged into the deepest current of 'the newness' in literature, and swam abreast with the advancing tide. You could borrow of him the last new book published in Germany on any question of philosophy and theology or of social ethics. He gladly lent it; for he had already read it. He read all books as soon as received, and read them through, as a hungry boy eats his cake up immediately, crumbs and all. He cared not for the looks of his books; he wasted no money on binding or choice editions. Books with him were to be read first by himself and then by any one else who wished to read them. His books also had a sacred odour of tobacco about them (for the good doctor followed in this matter also the habits of German

students), and were marked all through by his diligent pencil. His life at Watertown was happy, in the midst of friends, of new ideas, plenty of new books, and suitable work.

"At Cambridge, as professor, we have the testimony of his students to his sympathy with them and their thoughts, and his fidelity in all his sphere of labour. No one ever was more able and willing than he to refer to all the literature on the subject before the class. His encyclopedic head poured out its stores for them without stint or limit,—

'Wild beyond rule or art, enormous bliss.'

The only defect in his mind was that its affluence exceeded its ordering and defining power,—an almost fatal defect in New England, where to have fixed opinions on all subjects has long been regarded as the first duty of man. Dr. Francis was slow to decide between opposing views. His mind, well acquainted with all that could be said on both sides, and too conscientious to be dogmatical, would sometimes disappoint the expectant students by leaving the question opened rather than settled. This left a sense of uncertainty in their minds, which is always unpleasant. But those students who possessed the power in themselves of thinking out conclusions lost nothing by this, while they derived vast help from the stored memory and ample resources of their teacher's mind. But if Dr. Francis, as a teacher, may have seemed sometimes to his impatient students to have hesitated too long before coming to a conclusion, this fault (if it was a fault) had no moral cause, but altogether an intellectual one. It was not from any fear of coming to unpopular conclusions; for no man was more brave than he when the time required it, though no man was more modest than he when he did not feel called to make himself prominent. He was eminently a manly and modest person. He would stand up in the defence of Theodore Parker or any other unpopular man, if he thought it necessary, though naturally preferring peace and retirement to any controversy. So that if any one, complaining of his theological indecision, should quote Shakspeare, and say, 'Yes and No are not good theology,' it would be unjust; for he did not begin with 'Yes' and end with 'No,' nor did he say both 'Yes' and 'No;' but he stated both sides, and waited before deciding till it could be seen that he was ready to decide aright. And in this tendency he was singularly balanced and sustained by the fortunate circumstance of having a colleague, whose name and nature are not 'Yes' and 'No,' but 'No' and 'Yes;'

who begins by criticism and denial of the false, and ends by the assertion and sharp statement of the ascertained: so that these two colleagues together seemed to be exact counterparts and supplements; and, in the two together, the able and earnest student had the means of satisfying his wants in opposite directions.

"Dr. Francis will long be lamented and missed by those who knew him. His kindly, happy nature kept him always young. Down to his last day he worked, hearing his classes in his house when he could not hear them elsewhere."

May 31, at the Parsonage, Mansfield, Notts, in her 29th year, MARY LÆTITIA, wife of the Rev. A. W. WORTHINGTON, second daughter of the late Robert Scott, Esq., of Stourbridge, and granddaughter of the Rev. Charles Wellbeloved. It would be difficult to describe the painful emotions produced through a wide circle of attached relatives and friends by the event which has removed one so tenderly beloved from the scene in which the fairest prospects of domestic happiness and useful activity seemed to open before her. The blow has been the more severe from the suddenness of its infliction. She had passed through a painful trial in the distressing illness and death of her infant daughter. This trial she bore with the resignation natural to a mind trained to cheerful and confident views of Divine Providence; but her strength had been greatly impaired by what she had done and suffered; an insidious disease had been creeping over the frame which had undermined the vital powers, and she sank peacefully and with little warning to her rest.

It is not by friends and relatives only that her early removal is mourned. She had devoted herself assiduously, in conjunction with her sisters, to the instruction of the young in the schools of which her family had long been patrons. The interest which she felt in her pupils did not cease with their school-days; it followed them to their homes; it watched anxiously and kindly over the course of their future lives. In the new sphere to which she had been transferred by marriage, she had begun to carry out the same benevolent plans; and deep was the sorrow with which the announcement of her death was received by all who had shared in her instructions. In contemplating the early death of those whose dispositions and principles had led us to anticipate for them many years of happiness in the tranquil discharge of duty, it is a consolation to reflect that the good which it was in their heart to do is an offering not less accept-

able to our Heavenly Father, though his dispensation has forbidden the fulfilment of their purpose. K.

June 2, aged 26, at the residence of her father, Mr. Samuel Broadrick, Dukinfield, ALICE, relict of the late Mr. Edwin BROWN, of Stalybridge.

June 10, at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Mr. ROBERT WALLACE, aged 72. The deceased had held office under the corporation from a period prior to the passing of the Municipal Bill of 1835. He was town-surveyor down to the year 1854, when the duties of his office, being too onerous for one individual, were divided on his own suggestion, and his department was limited to the management of the corporate estates and property. "His very numerous pursuits, and their varied character," observes the *Newcastle Journal*, "brought him, throughout his long and useful career, in contact with almost every public man in the town; and by the entire populace who knew him, he was held in high respect, which was possibly only excelled by the unlimited confidence reposed in him by his employers, the Town Council." Frank and modest, active and unobtrusive, and ever ready to do good and kindly service where he had the power, no man was more generally esteemed in Newcastle than Mr. Robert Wallace. He was, with the late George Stephenson, one of the founders of the Newcastle Mechanics' Institute, and never ceased to be numbered amongst its warmest friends and supporters. He was a member of its committee from the beginning, and held the office of treasurer at the time of his death. He had for some years been out of health, but continued to discharge his public duties to the last. On the 8th inst., the head meeting-day of the Incorporated Company of House Carpenters, of which fraternity he was the oldest member, he was present with the rest, but became indisposed, and had to be taken home in a cab. He soon recovered, however, and continued to obey the manifold calls of his arduous appointment. On the morning of the 10th, he drove from his residence to the boys' school connected with St. Mary's church, Ryehill, for the purpose of laying out the playground and attending to other matters. Thence he proceeded to the Town-Hall buildings to look over some documents which were that day to be laid before the Council; and this done, he proceeded, apparently in his usual health, to his office in the Guildhall, intending to return in time for the meeting. He had walked down the Side, and was turning

the corner that he might cross the Sandhill, when he staggered and fell. He was instantly conveyed in a cab to the residence of Sir John Fife (who, however, was not at home), and he was thence driven to his own house at St. Thomas's Terrace. Dr. Frost had been taken up by the way, and Sir John shortly afterwards arrived; but death was already there. The deceased was of the Unitarian faith. He was one of the pupils of the boys' school in Hanover Square, and, with many others, gratefully acknowledged through life the obligations which he owed to the Rev. Wm. Turner. To this feeling of gratitude and veneration he gave graceful expression, when co-operating with the Rev. George Harris in the erection of the Church of the Divine Unity, by inserting, at his own sole charge, a beautiful memorial window. He filled his accustomed seat in that place of worship on Sunday morning, the 7th inst.; and his fellow-worshippers, who knew his worth and held him in high esteem, now mourn their loss. Deceased, who was a widower, has left behind him but one child, a daughter, married to Mr. G. W. Harris, son of the late Rev. George Harris, and resident in London. He was known to many of our ministers, to whom, on their visits to Newcastle, his hospitable home was ever open, and who quickly learned to appreciate the generous disposition of honest Robert Wallace. Whatever characteristics he had were thorough and genuine; and he was emphatically a solid, strong and honest man, generous and open-handed when his shrewd judgment and sound common sense had first satisfied him that the object to be attained was benevolent, useful or commendable. His remains were buried in Westgate cemetery.

June 11, at Loughborough, Mr. THOMAS COOPER, aged 81. Mr. Cooper, who lived for many years at Thornton, in Leicestershire, and was known and respected as a member and officer of the Presbyterian congregation of Bardon, on Charnwood Forest, spent the last years of his life in a very retired way at Loughborough. His death was peaceful and without suffering, brought on by a gradual decay of the natural strength.

June 14, at 32, Leinster Square, Bayswater, after a long and painful illness, SARA, only sister of the late Rev. Edward TAGART.

June 23, at his residence, Stamford Hill, THOMAS CORBYN JANSON, Esq., in the 54th year of his age.